



University  
of Glasgow

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>

Theses Digitisation:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/research/enlighten/theses/digitisation/>

This is a digitised version of the original print thesis.

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study,  
without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first  
obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any  
format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author,  
title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>  
[research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk)

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Faculty of Divinity

---

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE HEBREW  
VERBAL SYSTEM WITH PARTICULAR  
REFERENCE TO THE USE OF THE TENSES

by

James Aiken Hughes

---

A dissertation presented to the  
University of Glasgow  
in terms of the requirements for  
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

July, 1962

Glasgow, Scotland

ProQuest Number: 10646356

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10646356

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

## PREFACE

The subject of the Hebrew tenses is by nature controversial, and hence it is with mixed emotions that we approach this study. It is with profound joy that we are privileged to work in this area of Hebrew syntax, and yet we are somewhat apprehensive. Men of unique skill and acumen are labouring in this field, rallying behind their views years of experience and a vast storehouse of knowledge not only in the Hebrew language but in the sister languages as well. Whereas in comparison we have only begun to scratch the surface. But it is our hope that what we are setting forth will be a small contribution to knowledge in this productive area of study.

Our interest in the problem of the tenses began under the capable tutelage of Professor R. Laird Harris, whose keen insight into the problem has helped to provide the superstructure upon which we have built. However, the particular view of extensive elemental influence on verbal usage is our own (as is much of the material on the Infinitive Absolute presented in Chapter II).

Also, we have been challenged anew by the works of celebrated Semitists such as G. R. Driver and F. R. Blake, and although we disagree with them on some basic points we have profited greatly from their treatises.

In conclusion, we are deeply indebted to our supervisor, the Reverend Professor John B. D. Mauchline, for his kind and patient understanding and helpful suggestions during the period of research; and above all we give heartfelt thanks to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who so graciously provided the strength and wisdom necessary to complete the research and the dissertation.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.....	ii
CHAPTER I. THE TENSES.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	2
PART I. THEORIES ADVANCED TO EXPLAIN THE SIGNIFICATION OF THE TENSES.....	3
PART II. VERB FORMS WHICH HAVE RECEIVED RECOGNITION AS STRAIGHT PAST TENSES.....	19
PART III. THE SIMPLE IMPERFECT AND THE PERFECT WITH NAM IN PAST TIME.....	25
PART IV. THE SIMPLE PERFECT IN FUTURE TIME.....	121
CONCLUSION.....	141
CHAPTER II. THE INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE.....	144
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	157

Chapter I  
The Tenses

## INTRODUCTION

The problem of the Hebrew verbal system has occupied and perplexed the minds of Semitic scholars for generations. Numerous treatises have been written on various phases of this important syntactical section of the Hebrew language, many of which have dealt with the most crucial of chapters: the signification of the so-called Imperfect and Perfect tenses. It is this chapter with which we shall deal primarily in this dissertation--with particular attention directed towards the use of the simple Imperfect and the Perfect with *weu* in past time and the simple Perfect in future time in the prose sections of the Old Testament.

In the area of the tenses, the problem of Hebrew syntax reaches its apex. At this focal point the issue burns with just as much fervour to-day as in days gone by, and yet we seem to be as far removed from a solution as our predecessors. It is true that we cannot hope to solve with finality such an intricate problem. The subject is too profound. We are not dealing with a mathematical formula but with a language rooted in antiquity. We should not, however, give up in despair, but rather we should accept the challenge and press on with renewed endeavour to examine all the lines of evidence.

Although the problem has been approached from different angles, incisive conclusions are wanting. The variant views seem to stem from the same bases. There have been no radical departures from the traditional theories. One may ask with propriety: Why is this? Is it because the theories are basically sound, or is it because they have not been seriously challenged? Are the principles upon which they have been founded well-established, or is this only presumption on the part of their adherents? Do these existing theories explain satisfactorily the use of the two tenses, or do they in reality leave much to be desired? We believe that the latter alternative in each of the foregoing questions

is actually the case, and that consequently a forthright re-examination of tense usage is in order.

In our approach to this difficult problem, we have attempted to eliminate from our thoughts any preconceived ideas: we have tried to be as objective as possible in our consideration of tense usage. We think that the forms should be permitted to speak for themselves, in so far as this is practicable under the existing circumstances. The more we survey this controversial chapter of Hebrew syntax, the more we are convinced that the theories advanced to explain the signification of the tenses have signally failed in this respect. Therefore, it will be seen that our treatment of the problem is quite different from precedent treatments. Perforce much of our argument is negative, but we trust that many positive features may be gleaned from its perusal. If our theory excites interest in areas worthy of further consideration we shall not have laboured in vain.

The general order of presentation is quite simple: at the outset we shall state the salient features of two traditional theories on the use of the tenses, and then of two modern theories, which have departed in some respects from the traditional theories but have retained the basic elements contained in them.<sup>1</sup> Then, with these points in mind, we shall present our theory and give detailed relevant material in defense of it.

---

It is not within the province of this dissertation to give a detailed account of these hypotheses, but merely to present a few prominent facts and thus to provide a basis for comparative study.

## PART I

### THEORIES ADVANCED TO EXPLAIN THE SIGNIFICATION OF THE TENSES

#### I. Traditional Theories:

##### A. The Time Point-Aspect Theory:

This theory contended that the two forms are principally employed to denote difference in time point, and therefore are to be construed as true tenses. According to this theory, the primary use of the Perfect is to denote actions in past time; thus it was called the preterite tense. The Imperfect on the other hand is used to predicate actions in future time; hence it was termed the future tense. But it was also contended that the Perfect is used in a secondary sense to predicate actions in future time and the Imperfect to predicate actions in past time, the Perfect denoting the absolute certainty of the occurrence of the future action and the Imperfect denoting the continuance or repetition of the past action. Thus difference in aspect is subordinately expressed by the same forms.

Isaac Nordheimer, an exponent of this theory, declares:

The Hebrew verb possesses but two primary forms for the designation of time, viz. the original simple form in which the idea of the action is predominant over that of the person, called the preterite, as  $\text{לָקַח}$ ...., and the derived form termed the future, in which the person predominates over the action, as  $\text{לִקְחוּ}$ ....<sup>1</sup>

Nordheimer says further that "the  $\text{לָקַח}$  form is independently employed to predicate an action entirely past at the time of narration...."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>I. Nordheimer, A Critical Grammar of the Hebrew Language (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1841), Vol. II, p. 156.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 161. In Arabic this usage is pointed out by means of the particle  $\text{لَمَّا}$ , see W. Wright, A Grammar of the Arabic Language (2d ed. rev.; London: Frederic Norgate, 1874), Vol. I, p. 319; also, in Ethiopic

Nordheimer asserts that "the ḥ'ḡḏ form..., denotes an action to be performed at some period posterior to the time of narration...."<sup>1</sup> But he contends that other factors must be taken into consideration:

As the two primary temporal forms ḥ'ḡḏ and ḥ'ḡḏ with their secondary ones ḥ'ḡḏ and ḥ'ḡḏ are employed to denote not only the simple past and future, but all the gradations of time to which in the occidental languages distinct verbal forms are assigned, and this too in an apparently irregular and arbitrary manner, the attempt to reduce their use to a set of rules few in number and simple in application has proved a source of great labour and perplexity to grammarians, hitherto attended with very incomplete success.<sup>2</sup>

Regarding the Imperfect's predicating an action in past time he states:

The absolute future or ḥ'ḡḏ form may be used to predicate not only a present action..., but also one performed before that time, and which is still continued, so as to admit of its being viewed as present....<sup>3</sup>

Thus it would be rendered by our present perfect.

Also Nordheimer contends:

This form [the ḥ'ḡḏ form] is further used to denote customary action which, although no longer continued at the time of narration, is viewed as permanently characteristic of its subject....<sup>4</sup>

Thus it would have a frequentative significance.

And then with a usage similar to our historical present:

Sometimes in animated description, the narrator speaks of an action that has already taken place as passing before his mind at the time of narration, in which case he also employs the

---

by means of ሰጽፈ, see A. Dillmann, *Ethiopic Grammar*, trans. J. A. Crichton (2nd ed.; London: Williams and Norgate, 1907), p. 167.

<sup>1</sup>Nordheimer, *loc. cit.* In Arabic this future usage is pointed out by means of the particle *سوف*, see Wright, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 315-316.

<sup>2</sup>Nordheimer, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 166-167.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 167.

future form with the force of a present....<sup>1</sup>

Nordheimer views the "relative future"  $\text{לֵּוּךְ}$  in past time thus:

The precise signification of the relative future..., depends on that of the absolute form with which it is connected. Hence if the absolute future or  $\text{לֵּוּךְ}$  form be employed to denote an event which is past at the time of narration..., a relative future following it will do so likewise....<sup>2</sup>

As respects the use of the simple Perfect in future time Nordheimer states:

When a writer wishes to denote the absolute certainty with regard to the occurrence of a future event, he often speaks of it as already passing before his mind, and in such case employs the  $\text{לֵּוּךְ}$  form as an emphatic present.... This form is also used to denote absolute certainty with regard to other future events.... The use of the  $\text{לֵּוּךְ}$  form as an emphatic future is frequently pointed out by a preceding particle or by its close relation to a preceding verb denoting future action.<sup>3</sup> (Underlining ours.)

This is the so-called Perfect of certainty or certitude.

The underlined portion shows that Nordheimer believes that the particle has an influential function, but not to the extent that an aspectual consideration is obviated.

It would appear that the duality of usage of the forms (i.e. to denote both time and aspect) places an onus on the theory. It is unlikely--in spite of the paucity of tense forms--that they express both concepts.

## B. The Aspect Theory:

This hypothesis vigorously opposed the time concept of the earliest theory. It postulated that Hebrew has no true tenses: the Perfect does not relate to past time, but is rather the form used to express actions viewed from the aspect of completion--be it employed

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 178.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 165-166.

in past, present or future time. The Imperfect on the other hand refers to actions viewed as incomplete in the different time areas. So it is aspect, irrespective of time, which determines the use of the two forms.

This theory was advocated by S. R. Driver, who says in the introduction of his treatise:

These tenses were formerly known by the familiar names of past and future, but inasmuch as the so-called past tense is continually used to describe events in the future, and the so-called future tense to describe events in the past, it is clear that these terms, adapted from languages cast in a totally different mould from the Hebrew and other Semitic tongues, are in the highest degree inappropriate and misleading. It will be better therefore to acquiesce in the names now generally employed by modern grammarians, and deduced from real and not fictitious or accidental characteristics of the two forms in question, and to call them by the terms perfect and imperfect respectively.<sup>1</sup>

In continuation he declared:

Now in Hebrew the tenses mark only differences in the kind of time (i.e. in aspect), not differences in the order of time (i.e. in time point, tense).....<sup>2</sup>

The Imperfect in past time is employed "in two different ways":

(1) when denoting a single act, it represents the act as "nascent"; and (2) when denoting an action "liable to occur more than once," it has a "frequentative" force.<sup>3</sup>

He contends that the Perfect with waw consecutive is employed in past time "after the impf. as a frequentative."<sup>4</sup> But with regard to the Perfect with waw copulative he states:

We find it used (1) upon occasions when a writer wishes to place two facts in co-ordination with one another, to exhibit the second as simultaneous with the first rather than as succeeding it; for instance, in the conjunction of two synonymous or similar

---

<sup>1</sup>S.R. Driver, A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew (3d ed. rev.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892), p.1.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p.3.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 27,30.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 127.



ideas: and (2), chiefly in the later books, when the language was allowing itself gradually to acquiesce in and adopt the mode of speech customary in the Aramaic dialects current at the time around Palestine, in which the rival construction with ·), at least in historical times, was never employed.<sup>1</sup>

Some of the other usages of the Perfect with waw Driver finds difficult to classify:

Of the instances which remain, those which occur in the later books may be fairly regarded as attributable to the influence of Aramaic usage: but for the few which are met with in the earlier books..., it is more than doubtful whether such an explanation is admissible.<sup>2</sup>

The employment of the simple Perfect in future time is stated thus by Driver:

The perfect is employed to indicate actions the accomplishment of which lies indeed in the future, but is regarded as dependent upon such an unalterable determination of the will that it may be spoken of as having actually taken place....<sup>3</sup>

A perusal of Driver's exhaustive work reveals how complex and artificial the aspect theory can be when carried to its logical--- which we consider to be illogical---conclusion. It is little wonder that this theory has been modified in recent years. F. R. Blake has well expressed our thoughts:

The detailed working out of this aspect theory..., has resulted in a hopeless confusion of forms and meanings, and to many fanciful explanations to account for differences in form. The whole treatment presents a picture strongly characterized by complexity, obscurity and artificiality, a system which it is difficult to imagine as developing and existing in the minds of any language group.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 159.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 160.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>4</sup>F. R. Blake, A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1951), p. 1.

## II. Modern Theories:

### A. The Aspect-Time Point Theory:

This theory is actually a modification of the aspect theory. Although its approach to tense usage is based on aspectual distinctions, it recognizes in a restricted sense the temporal idea. This theory in general links the so-called Imperfect with waw consecutive (as well as the Imperfect with other particles such as  $\gamma \times$  and  $\text{𐤀 𐤓 𐤕}$ ) with the Accadian preterite and contends that "the future sense of the old universal qatil" is preserved "in prose when marked by certain safeguards, namely with consecutive waw and certain other particles."<sup>1</sup> But this hypothesis does not acknowledge that the futuristic use of the old affirmative verb is preserved in all cases where the Perfect is employed--whether with or without waw--in the future prose sections. Nor does this theory hold that all the simple Imperfect forms in the past prose sections are vestigia of an archaic preterite tense of the preformative type.<sup>2</sup>

G. R. Driver, a chief proponent of this theory, has this to say about the Imperfect with waw consecutive (arguing from the standpoint of accentuation):

The accent in way-yibn 'and he built' is in the same position as in the Acc. ibni 'he built.' The accentuation of the Hebrew verb, then, in the construction with consecutive waw is that of the primitive Semitic speech as exhibited in the Accadian language and must therefore be regarded not as a peculiarity invented by the Hebrews but as an archaism surviving from the common proto-Semitic speech.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>G. R. Driver, Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), pp. 88-89.

<sup>2</sup>Driver (ibid., p. 146) admits that "occasionally" a simple Imperfect in past prose has a preteritive force.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 89-90.

Driver contends also that the simple Imperfect is used in a preterite sense after certain particles:

In Hebrew the (apparently imperfect) yiqṭōl is at times employed in a purely preterite sense. This occurs principally after the particle 'āz 'then' as well as generally after terem 'before' and occasionally after 'ad 'until'....<sup>1</sup>

He asserts that the Perfect with waw consecutive is "found in past time in reference to habitual states or actions lasting over a considerable time" and argues that it is an "archaistic use of the perfect qāṭal accented when possible like the Accadian permansive qāṭil...."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand he asserts that the use of the Perfect with waw copulative is often difficult to determine:

Yet it must be admitted that by no means all the passages where the perfect tense with weak wāw takes or seems to take the place of the imperfect tense with strong wāw can be explained....<sup>3</sup>

The use of the Perfect in future time is viewed by Driver thus:

The same (Perfect) form may also serve to indicate a state or an act of which the accomplishment has not yet taken place but is regarded as inevitable.... From this it is but a short step to the use of the same form as a purely future tense whether of state or of action..., in Hebrew the verb...may stand alone in poetry while in prose it requires to be introduced by consecutive waw....<sup>4</sup>

Driver also asserts that the Perfect is "used peculiarly, especially in questions, with a future-perfect force where a simple future tense would rather be expected...."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 87.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 113. Driver may be correct in his assertion that the Perfect with waw consecutive in past time is an archaistic form. In addition to the argument of accentuation, which could be valid in defense of an archaic usage, the fact that the Perfect with waw in past time often appears in connection with the simple Imperfect (which we believe is an archaism) might be advanced in support of this contention.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 129. <sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 116. <sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 117.

This school realizes that the aspect theory in its early form left much to be desired. As a result, it has modified the position. We believe that the theory in its present form has moved closer to the true usage of the tenses, but that it still has weaknesses. As a case in point, at least the theory in its original state was consistent; for it viewed all forms of the preformative type as expressing incomplete action. But to-day the theory has given it a dual role in past time: in some cases it is a straight (aoristic) past tense and in others it is an incomplete past tense. This duality of usage seems to be a main weak point in the theory as it exists to-day, just as it was a prime weak point--but from a different viewpoint--in the earliest theory.

#### B. The Time Point-Aspect Theory:

This modern theory is somewhat the reverse of the above-mentioned modern theory, for it asserts that the two forms are mainly employed to denote difference in time point or tense. Hence this theory corresponds more or less to the earliest theory in that it relegates the aspectual concept to a subordinate position. But what is more significant, it sees--in agreement with the before-mentioned modern theory--possible preterites in some simple Imperfects (in addition to the Imperfect with  $\tau\chi$  and  $\Pi\tau\sigma$ ) in the past prose sections. However, this theory views the usage of the Perfect with  $\omega\omega$  in past time and the simple Perfect in future time in much the same way as the above-named theories.

This theory is advocated by F. R. Blake, who has tried desperately to extricate himself from the shackles of the aspectual concept. Here is what he says in the introduction of his treatise:

The same multiplicity of meanings presented by the verb forms will, of course, be found, but with the elimination of the aspect hypothesis they will appear in a new light, one which is in accordance with common sense and with scientific

linguistic principles.<sup>1</sup>

From this statement one might conclude that Blake has eliminated the aspectual concept. But that such is not the case is clear from the following remarks:

It is true that aspect is...indicated by the Semitic verbal forms, e.g. the imperfect...as a progressive past (imperfect proper) indicates incomplete action or continuance, and the perfect as a simple past indicates completed action, but these aspectual meanings are always accompanied by and are subordinate to the time point meaning or tense.<sup>2</sup>

As indicated in the final clause of the preceding quotation, Blake places a premium on the time concept. The thought is developed in this declaration:

A priori it seems unlikely that any language would vary the forms of its verb without regard to the most prominent function of that part of speech, which indicates process, and which imparts the idea of motion in time to a sentence..., namely its indication of the time point of an action or state, its tense. Moreover all the peculiarities of meaning presented by the Semitic verbal forms are capable of a clear and reasonable explanation based on tense, without regard to any fundamental aspect theory.<sup>3</sup>

Blake contends that the Imperfect in past time is used as a "progressive or repeated past," and as a "preterite...with adverbs  $\text{HX}$ ,  $\text{H76}$  ...after the conjunctions  $\text{H76L}$ ,  $\text{7Y}$  ...after "conversive" and "apparently in a number of other passages" as in dependent clauses "after a conjunctional word or phrase as with  $\text{H76L}$ ,  $\text{7Y}$  above...."<sup>4</sup> These words are full of import, for they seem to place the emphasis on the preterite meaning of the Imperfect form.

Blake strikes another significant note when he states that the variant meanings of the Imperfect "are due not to the verb form itself, but to the character of the construction...."<sup>5</sup> We believe that the type of construction plays a vital role in a study of the tenses, as we

<sup>1</sup>Blake, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 9-10.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

shall indicate shortly.

"The perfect with ! [in past time] has regularly the same... progressive past...meaning which is characteristic of the imperfect...."<sup>1</sup> Later in his presentation Blake says that the Perfect with waw "occurs in two types, viz. one converted to imperfect meaning, and one, much less common, which remains a past tense...."<sup>2</sup>

The simple Perfect in future time is "to be regarded as use of the present for the future...." and is used "as a future perfect, normally in multiple sentences...."<sup>3</sup>

### III. Our Theory:

The theory we are propounding in this dissertation is opposed to all the above-mentioned hypotheses to a varied extent and is diametrically antithetical to the earliest form of the aspect theory. Of course it is realized that it is not difficult for one to find what one considers are fallacies in any existing theory in this phase of Hebrew syntax, but to produce an acceptable alternative is quite another matter and no mean task. We are therefore not presuming to place before the reader a theory which will emerge unscathed from the battle. But it is hoped that what we propose will stimulate interest in areas which have lain dormant.

After an exhaustive survey of the Hebrew tenses (as they appear in the prose sections) we have reached conclusions, many of which, so far as we can ascertain, have not been presented heretofore. We have sought to build our theory on the idea that the Hebrew language, as well as the other Semitic dialects, is quite distinct from the languages in the society in which we live. In other words, our problem seems to revolve round the vast difference between the Semitic languages and the languages with which we are familiar in our Western

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 17.      <sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 50.      <sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

culture. It appears that Semitists have tried to view the Oriental languages in an Indo-European setting, with results that have been neither convincing nor conclusive.<sup>1</sup> The fine lines of distinction in the tenses of the Occidental languages bring vividness to their verbal schemes, but we believe that it is impossible to transfer these features of precision to languages which have been built on entirely different bases. It must be remembered that although Hebrew has only two tenses within its possession, these tenses cannot without difficulty be mustered to perform the diverse functions of the several tenses in a Western language such as, let us say, Greek.

It should be noted, however, that Greek, in spite of its preciseness, does have a tense which has been called the "maid of all work"<sup>2</sup> because of its extensive use: the aorist (ἀόριστος) tense, which expresses the action or state in an undefined manner or indefinitely. The aorist can be used to describe "a momentary action," as he died, or to describe "an extended act or state," as he remained, or even to describe "a series of acts," as he sacrificed. Yet the aorist was not chosen to bring out these distinctive elements, for that is not its function. Rather the aorist views each action "as constituting a single fact"; an action may be complete or incomplete, but the aorist views it indefinitely, i.e. irrespective of its completeness or incompleteness.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Nor was this problem impertinent long ago: "The obstacles that have opposed the elucidation of the uses of the tenses in Hebrew and its cognate dialects, seem mostly to have arisen from the notions derived by occidental scholars from the manner in which the various points of time are indicated in the Indo-European languages, rather than from the nature of the subject itself." (Nordheimer, op. cit., p. 156.)

<sup>2</sup>K. S. Wuest, Hebrews in the Greek New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), p. 116.

<sup>3</sup>See E. D. Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek (3rd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898), pp. 19-20.

Further, the aorist is not confined to past time. The present and future can be viewed aoristically as well as the past; and we are of the opinion that this aoristic concept working in every time area covers the usage of the Hebrew tenses, and that therefore a difference in aspect is not the determinative factor in the use of the two tenses. The idea conveyed by the aorist seems to be most conducive to the simplicity of usage exhibited in the Hebrew tenses. In short, we believe that there is no action performed by the two tenses in Hebrew which cannot be viewed in a punctiliar or aoristic sense.

But here a question arises: Is not one justified in saying that the time of the action is not determinative? A cursory study of the Hebrew Scriptures reveals the omnitemporal use of both forms. Wherein then lies the distinction between the two forms? There may be no difference between the two tenses--form excepted--as they appear in the Hebrew Bible. At most this distinction is hardly more than relative. The extant situation is that of an heterogeneous syntax, i.e. there are not only stylistic variations, but also there is a convergence of idioms from various stages of the language's history. Hence a conglomerate picture is presented, which precludes an absolute uniformity of usage. We do not mean to imply by this, however, that the kind of action expressed by the verb differs from one stratum to another, nor that the Imperfect expresses the action in a different way from the Perfect. It is our impression that the verb has an aoristic force irrespective of form (i.e. be it the Imperfect or the Perfect) and period.

The situation in Accadian suggests that in the proto-Semitic speech the preformative verb yactul denoted action and the affirmative verb qatil signified state, for in Accadian the preterite-preformative tense igtul denotes action and the permansive-affirmative qatil denotes state.<sup>1</sup> But there came a time when the affirmative verb gathered active

---

<sup>1</sup>See W. Von Soden, "Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik," Analecta Orientalia, No. 33 (1952), pp. 100ff. In Ugaritic there is a similar



meaning, resulting in an obscuration of the original distinction (apart from the preservation of the intransitive use of the Perfect in stative verbs).

Probably originally both forms were unrestricted with respect to the time, i.e. they were timeless (zeitlos) or omnitemporal (allzeitig) predicative elements.<sup>1</sup> Hence certain forms which meet us in the Hebrew Bible may be vestiges of the old timeless use, whereas others may be true tense forms representing a later strand. So that which strikes our eyes as an ambiguity of usage may be the presence of convergent strands. In the case of the older forms the time sphere may be indicated by particles or other elements outside the verb forms.<sup>2</sup> But in the case of the later forms it may be the forms themselves which indicate the time sphere.

In spite of certain indeterminate factors, a close examination of the Hebrew tenses reveals a number of curiosities which apparently have been overlooked in previous treatments. In our survey of the prose sections, which represent the basic style of the language, we found that invariably the simple Imperfect in past time and the simple Perfect in future time are employed in an especial type of construction. Evidently there is something outside the verbal form itself which influences its usage. Most notable are certain particles used with the verb.

Now we are well aware of the pervasive use of the particles and consequently have moved with caution in our study in this field, and

---

situation; see A. Goetze, "The Tenses of Ugaritic," American Oriental Society Offprint Series, No. 8 (1938), pp. 289-290. The proto-Semitic yqtul form might be termed the "active aorist" and the qatil form the "stative aorist," indicative of what appears to have been the original usage of the forms.

<sup>1</sup>See H. Bauer and P. Leander, Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1922), Vol. I, p.270.; T. W. Thacker, The Relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian Verbal Systems (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), p. 104.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Bauer and Leander, loc. cit.

yet it seems to be undeniable that particles have a definite role to play in the verbal picture--just how much cannot be certainly known; but it is admitted in most--if not all--quarters that certain temporal particles (i.e.  $\text{לֵאמֹר}$  and  $\text{עַד}$ ) and of course the particle  $\text{וַאֲזַיְתָה$  appear with an Imperfect in its preterite sense. This admission opens the door to further investigation. In this light, we may assume that yet other particles also occur with the Imperfect as a preterite tense. We realize that this presents a problem: the same particles which occur with the Imperfect in past time also appear with the Imperfect in future time, and with the Perfect. The same argument, however, may be advanced against the temporal particles, which it is acknowledged do appear with the Imperfect when it has preteritive meaning; for these temporal particles also occur before Imperfect forms in future time, and even before Perfect forms.<sup>1</sup>

For the sake of consistency, it is suggested that either a wider range of particles be considered in an analysis of verbal usage, or that the possibility of their influencing this usage be disregarded in toto. We are not prepared to accept the latter alternative. Such idiomatic constructions as the Imperfect with  $\text{וַאֲזַיְתָה}$  consecutive and the Perfect with  $\text{וַאֲזַיְתָה}$  consecutive (along with other idioms such as  $\text{וַאֲזַיְתָה}$  "would that,"  $\text{כֵּן אָמַר יְהוָה}$  "thus says the LORD," as well as  $\text{וַאֲזַיְתָה}$  "lest,"  $\text{כְּדֵיכֵן}$  "in order that,"  $\text{אָז}$  "then" and  $\text{עַד}$  "not yet," regularly employed with the Imperfect) are examples which seem to show beyond all doubt the validity of our contention that the particle cannot be ignored in a study of the verb. If this be true, the criterion for determining verbal usage is not to be found in the verbal form itself, but in the verb together with the element(s) in construction with it, i.e. in the entire idiomatic construction.

---

<sup>1</sup>Blake (op. cit., p. 9.) says that "this seems to represent a syntactical situation later than that with the imperfect in a past sense."

Accordingly, it would appear that an Imperfect form occurs in past time not because it denotes the incompleteness or continuance of an action (as the aspectual theorists would have us believe), but due to the kind of construction in which it is employed. It seems reasonable to assume that such a construction became stereotyped somewhere along the line in the historical development of the language and thus resisted change. If this analysis be correct, all the Imperfect forms in past time are remnants of an archaic preterite tense of the preformative type.<sup>1</sup> Although these vestigial forms are regularly employed

---

<sup>1</sup>See R.L. Harris, "Tenses of the Hebrew Verb," The Journal (of the Faith Theological Seminary Alumni Association), V. No.1 (Fall, 1952), pp. 8-13. He argues that the simple Imperfect in past prose, as well as the Imperfect with *vav* consecutive, is a survival of an old past tense. See also J.H. Greenberg, "The Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Present," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 72 (1952), p. 2. He contends that proto-Semitic had a preterite of the preformative type from which stem the Akkadian preterite and the Arabic, Aramaic and Hebrew Imperfect forms; and Z.S. Harris, "Conditioned Sound Change in Ras Shamra," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 57, (1937), p. 152. He sees in Ras Shamra two preterite forms of the preformative type: the common *yagtulu* and the short *yagtul* form. Cf. Z. Harris, "Development of the Canaanite Dialects," American Oriental Series, Vol. 16 (1939), pp. 46-47. Also, according to R. Meyer ("Das Hebräische Verbalsystem im Lichte der gegenwertigen Forschung," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. VII, (1960), pp. 313, 315) the indicative *yagtulu*, as well as the Jussive-Preterite *yagtul*, has a preteritive meaning in Ugaritic and "geradezu als der eigentliche Erzählungsmodus angesprochen werden muss." In the Old Testament, however, "beide--Präteritum/Jussiv und Indikativ--treten ihre erzählende beziehungsweise präteritale Funktion sehr stark an das affigierende *qatala* > *qatal* ab.... Präteritale Bedeutung hat die Kurzform *yagtul* nur noch in der festen Verbindung *wayyiqtol*...; auch der alte Indikativ kann hier und da noch--besonders in der Dichtung und nach einigen Konjunktionen--erzählenden Charakter tragen." But we may ask: If *yagtulu* has a preterite force in Ugaritic, and is the regular narrative form in that language, why must the preteritive meaning of the Imperfect in Hebrew be restricted to the poetic portions and to union with some conjunctions such as *ʾet* in prose?

in conjunction with the preterite forms of the affirmative type (the Perfect) in the prose narrative idiom of the Perfect-Imperfect with waw consecutive, the same forms without waw (as well as the Perfect with waw consecutive often found in connection with them) are straight past tenses, i.e. aoristic past tenses.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the simple Perfect form occurs in future time, not as a supposed Perfect of certainty but as an aoristic future tense, due to the type of construction in which it is used.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Of course the Imperfect in translation sometimes has a present perfect or past perfect force, but this is merely the English signification.

<sup>2</sup>Of course the Perfect in translation occasionally has a future perfect force, but this is merely the English signification.

## PART II

### VERB FORMS WHICH HAVE RECEIVED RECOGNITION AS STRAIGHT PAST TENSES

#### I. The Imperfect with Waw Consecutive:

In our day it is generally recognized that the so-called Imperfect with waw consecutive is preteritive in significance. The consensus of opinion relates it to the Accadian preterite igtul, which is considered to be a vestigium of the proto-Semitic yagtul.

In some West-Semitic dialects a verb-form with the pattern yagtul in the simple theme is employed in a fashion which does not conform with the definitions of the imperfect and the jussive. It agrees with the Accadian preterite igtul in meaning.... In [Hebrew] prose this employment is normal after wa 'and'.<sup>1</sup>

Apart from form, the Imperfect with waw consecutive, of common occurrence in prose narration, seems to differ not one whit from the Perfect. Both are preteritive in force. An example or two should suffice to indicate this usage:

a) Genesis 3:1 "And the serpent was (hāyāh) subtle...., and said (wayyō'mer)"

b) Genesis 4:1 "And Adam knew (yāda') Eve his wife, and she conceived (wattahar) and bore (wattēled)"<sup>2</sup>

#### II. The Imperfect with $\text{לְכֵן}$ "then" and $\text{לְפָנַי}$ "before, not yet"<sup>3</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup>Thacker, op. cit., pp. 173-174.

<sup>2</sup>The same pattern (i.e. a Perfect followed by an Imperfect) is found in Ugaritic. See C.H. Gordon, "Ugaritic Handbook," Analecta Orientalia, No. 25 (1947), p. 57; E. Hammershaimb, Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Schamra (Kopenhagen:Ejnar Munksgaard, 1941), p. 93; H. Cazelles, "Note sur l'origine des temps convertis hébreux (d'après quelques textes ugaritiques)," Revue Biblique, LIV (1947), pp. 388-393.

<sup>3</sup>C. Brockelmann (Hebräische Syntax (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1956), pp. 42-43), however, as late as

The Imperfect with these particles is considered to be an archaism.

Alter (ursemitischer) Stil.

.....

2. yagtul in der Zeitsphäre eines Partic. perf. (assy. iksūd).

a) nach Waw consecutivum.

b) nach den Partikeln  $\text{ܐܕ}$ ,  $\text{ܐܕܝܢ}$ ,  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢ}$ , ....<sup>1</sup>

Here are some examples:

a) Joshua 8:30 "Then ('āz) Joshua built (yibneh) an altar"

b) Joshua 10:33 "Then ('āz) Horam went up ('ālāh)"

c) Genesis 24:15 "Before (terem) he (had) finished (killāh)"

d) Genesis 24:45 "Before (terem) I (had) finished ('<sup>a</sup>kalleh)"

A straight past signification for the Imperfects is most suitable, as shown by the Perfects used with the same particles.

### III. The Imperfect with $\text{ܐܕܝܢ}$ "until"<sup>2</sup>

The Imperfect with this particle is quite generally recognized as an archaistic form.<sup>3</sup> Here are two examples (one with the Perfect and the other with the Imperfect):

---

1956 contended that yigtāl has imperfective, not preteritive, meaning after  $\text{ܐܕܝܢ}$  and  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢ}$ . He terms the Imperfect the "kursive Aspekt." In Aramaic the Imperfect after  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢ}$  "then" and  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ}$  "at that time" corresponds to the Hebrew Imperfect after  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢ}$  "then"; Bauer says that it "mag auf hebräischem Einfluss (Impf. nach  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢ}$ ) beruhen." ("Die Tempora im Semitischen," Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, Vol. 8 (1910), p. 45.) The Arabic Jussive (in form only) after  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢ}$  "not yet" and the Syriac Imperfect after  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ}$  "before" correspond to the Hebrew Imperfect after  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ}$  "before, not yet." See Wright, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 22 and 41, and T. Nöldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar, trans. J. A. Crichton (London: Williams and Norgate, 1904), p. 209.

<sup>1</sup>Bauer, op. cit., p. 35.

<sup>2</sup>The Syriac Imperfect after  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ}$  "until" corresponds to the Hebrew Imperfect after  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ}$  "until." See Nöldeke-Crichton, loc. cit. Note also Ezra 5:5, where  $\text{ܐܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ}$  occurs with an Imperfect in past time.

<sup>3</sup>E.g. see G. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 87; Blake, op. cit., p. 10.

- a) Joshua 2:22 "And they remained there three days, until ('ad) the pursuers had returned (šābū)"
- b) Joshua 10:13 "And the sun stood, and the moon stopped until ('ad) a nation had avenged (yaqōm) its enemies"

IV. The Imperfect with the particles  $\text{וְ}$ ,  $\text{וְשֶׁ}$  and  $\text{וְכִי}$  (in a temporal sense equivalent to  $\text{וְכִי}$ ), although apparently only in isolated cases:

F.R. Blake cites I Kings 21:6 in relation to  $\text{וְ}$ , II Kings 8:29 in relation to  $\text{וְשֶׁ}$ , and a poetic verse (Psalm 66:6) in relation to  $\text{וְכִי}$ .<sup>1</sup>

Obs. The foregoing admissions bring us to the crossroads in this vital area of Hebrew syntax. If one admits that the Imperfect is used as a straight past tense in the above examples, is there any formidable reason why it cannot be so used in other cases? It appears that one must make a choice: either one must entertain the possibility that all the Imperfects in past time are remnants of an archaic preterite tense of the preformative type, or one must retreat to the original position of the aspect theory, which held that all the Imperfects in past time denote incompleteness. As soon as the Imperfect with *waw* consecutive became recognized as a preterite tense, the aspect theory took a turn which may have put it on the defensive. For once one admits that the Imperfect with *waw* consecutive is a straight past tense, all the uses of the Imperfect in past time must be re-examined. And the re-examination has shown that one cannot stop with the Imperfect consecutive, for immediately it was seen that the Imperfect with other particles such

---

<sup>1</sup>Blake, *ibid.* It is interesting to note in this connection that an older grammarian, F. Böttcher (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1868), Vol. II, p. 150), viewed the Imperfect as a preterite when it is used with "particles of ingress," such as  $\text{וְכִי}$  Gen. 2:10 "und von da trennte er sich" and  $\text{וְ}$  I Kings 21:6 "als ich zu N. redete (mit N. zu reden kam)." This use is equivalent to the Gr. "ingressive aorist."

as  $\text{וַיֵּלֶךְ}$  and  $\text{וַיֵּלֶךְ}$  is also a straight past tense. In other words, this started a "chain reaction." When G. R. Driver says that "it is not impossible that traces of this archaic preterite usage have survived also in the common speech" and F. R. Blake states that the Imperfect is used as a preterite "apparently in a number of other passages," they seem to be admitting that one cannot stop halfway.<sup>1</sup> This leaves an open door for the consideration of our theory that all the Imperfects in past time are vestiges of an old preterite tense.

#### V. The Perfect with waw copulative

This form is employed in connection with and in the same way as the simple Perfect which precedes it. The following examples show this usage:

- a) Genesis 31:7 "And your father trifled (hētel) with me and altered (wēheh<sup>e</sup>lip) my wage"
- b) Deuteronomy 2:30 "For the LORD your God hardened (hiqšāh) his spirit and made obstinate (wē<sup>e</sup>immēs) his heart"

Obs. The admission that the Perfect with waw copulative is a straight past tense could recoil against the aspect theory. For coupled with this admission is also the admission that the waw prefix in this instance does not alter the force of the verb to which it is attached. Now if it does not alter the force of the verb in the one case, this would seem to argue against its altering the force of the verb in the other case, i.e. in the idiom termed the Perfect with waw consecutive. It is unlikely that the conjunction waw has the power to convert the action of the verb form to which it is joined.<sup>2</sup> And it is

---

<sup>1</sup>G. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 142; Blake, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup>See J. Weingreen, A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), p. 91. Of course we do not concur with Weingreen that a Perfect denotes completed action and an Imperfect continuous action, but we do agree that a conjunction can hardly change the force of the verb form with which it is employed.



just as implausible that the waw could convert the action in one instance and not in another. S. R. Driver contends that "a real difference of some kind or other exists between the use of the perfect with simple waw, and the use of the perfect with waw consecutive, and the external indication of this difference is to be found in the alteration of the tone which constantly attends and accompanies it."<sup>1</sup> But one may ask: Does this change of tone represent a change in the force of the verb, or merely a change in the usage of the waw? Of course the ambiguity lies (at least in part) in the fact that the so-called strong waw and the so-called weak waw look alike when attached to the Perfect, whereas in the case of the Imperfect there is a difference in the form of the waw. The cognates furnish evidence that the two forms of waw are not phenomena peculiar to Hebrew. The strong waw ( · ) probably corresponds to the Accadian enclitic -ma and the Arabic ع(fa); the weak waw ( ! ) on the other hand probably answers to the Accadian u and the Arabic و(wa).<sup>2</sup> Hence by analogy we may say that to all intents and purposes there are two forms of the waw with the Perfect, whereas the Perfect in each case is one and the same form. Consequently it is easier to suppose that the difference lies in the usage of the waw and not in the usage of the verb.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>S. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 115.

<sup>2</sup>See G. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 92; for the Accadian forms see Von Soden, op. cit., pp. 170, 177, and A. Ungnad, Babylonisch-assyrische Grammatik (2d ed.; München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926, p. 72; for the Arabic forms see Wright, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 323-324. Note also Ugaritic "w = wa" and "p = pa( ع )," (Gordon, op. cit., p. 91.)

<sup>3</sup>The question may be asked: What is the difference in the usage of the waw conjunctions? It appears that the strong waw ( · ) with the Imperfect consecutive and ! with the Perfect consecutive) had originally a demonstrative force, as "then, so." Regarding · with the Imperfect consecutive, V. Maag, in a recent treatment of the subject, says that there are a number of deictic particles of the root "han," and that the strong waw used with the Imperfect is formed from this root. When a simple shewa stands before the "h" in "han," both elements (the shewa and the "h") often disappear. Therefore w'hanyiktoḥ "and then he writes"

becomes wanyiktob, and then by assimilation of the "n" becomes wavyiktob. ("Morphologie des hebräischen Narrativs," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Vol. 65 (1953), pp. 86-88.) This argument respecting the origin of the meaning and the form of the strong waw used with the Imperfect sounds quite convincing, and may well explain the phenomenon. (For a different treatment, but also with the stress on an early deictic usage of the waw, see G. J. Thierry, "Notes on Hebrew Grammar and Etymology," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Vol IX (1951), pp. 5-7.) The waw consecutive with the Perfect has a correspondent use. H. Ewald (Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes (8th ed.; Göttingen: Dieterichsche Buchhandlung, 1870), p. 600) and G. Bergsträsser (Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen (München: Max Hueber, 1928), p. 41) contended that the waw consecutive with the Perfect was developed by polarity or inverse analogy from the idiom of the waw consecutive with the Imperfect. But its origin is better explained by H. L. Ginsberg: "The Ras Shamra texts...supplement his [Bergsträsser's] theory by showing that the development of the perfect consecutive was not purely a polar consequence of the development of the imperfect consecutive, but was favoured by the fact that one of the original functions of the perfect was that of an optative and precative." ("The Rebellion and Death of Ba'lu," Orientalia, Vol. 5 (1936), p. 177.) The weak waw or waw copulative used with the Perfect was very likely in its original usage a mere copulative. Hence there seems to be this underlying distinction in the usage of the waw conjunctions: "and then" or "and so" for the waw consecutive and a mere "and" for the waw copulative, as suggested by the different uses in Accadian and Arabic (see Von Soden and Wright respectively, both loc. cit.). But this does not explain why different conjunctions are employed with the Imperfect and Perfect consecutive constructions. The difference may be explained by the situation which prevails in Accadian. The affirmative verb seems to have had a nominal origin, and in Accadian the permansive (afformative) verb is employed with the conjunction u, which joins nouns. (See Friedrich Delitzsch, Assyrisches Handwörterbuch (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896), p. 1; and G. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 91.) The prefix w<sup>e</sup> used with the Perfect in Hebrew is probably related to this conjunction u used with the permansive in Accadian, as the conjunction proper to verbs of nominal origin.

# PART III

## THE SIMPLE IMPERFECT AND THE PERFECT WITH WAW IN PAST TIME

### I. Statistical Survey:<sup>1</sup>

- A. Total number of books: 17
- B. Total number of verb forms: 488
- C. Total number of Imperfect forms: 228
- D. Total number of Perfect forms with waw: 260
- E. Number of forms in each book:

1. Genesis.....	Imperf. 14 Perf./w 21 Total 35	2. Exodus.....	Imperf. 24 Perf./w 27 Total 51
3. Leviticus ....	Imperf. 2 Perf./w 1 Total 3	4. Numbers.....	Imperf. 25 Perf./w 20 Total 45
5. Deuteronomy...	Imperf. 10 Perf./w 2 Total 12	6. Joshua.....	Imperf. 5 Perf./w 9 Total 14
7. Judges.....	Imperf. 15 Perf./w 9 Total 24	8. I Samuel.....	Imperf. 28 Perf./w 38 Total 66
9. II Samuel.....	Imperf. 16 Perf./w 24 Total 40	10. I Kings.....	Imperf. 31 Perf./w 21 Total 52
11. II Kings.....	Imperf. 17 Perf./w 42 Total 59	12. Ruth.....	Imperf. 0 Perf./w 1 Total 1
13. Esther.....	Imperf. 7 Perf./w 4 Total 11	14. Ezra(Heb.Sec.).	Imperf. 1 Perf./w 6 Total 7
15. Nehemiah.....	Imperf. 7 Perf./w 6 Total 13	16. I Chronicles...	Imperf. 9 Perf./w 7 Total 16
17. II Chronicles..	Imperf. 17 Perf./w 22 Total 39		

<sup>1</sup>Exceptive forms: the Imperfect with the particles  $\text{וְאֵלֶּכְךָ}$  and  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  (1), and the introductory formula  $\text{וְהָיָה}$ .

- F. Greatest number of verb forms: 66 (I Samuel)
- G. Least number of verb forms: 1 (Ruth)
- H. Most Imperfect forms: 31 (I Kings)
- I. Most Perfect forms with waw: 42 (II Kings)
- J. Distribution of the forms:
  - 1. More Imperfect forms than Perfect forms with waw: 8 books (Lev., Num., Deut., Judg., I Kings, Esth., Neh., I Chron.)
  - 2. More Perfect forms with waw than Imperfect forms: 9 books (Gen., Exod., Josh., I Sam., II Sam., II Kings, Ruth, Ezr., II Chron.)

The distribution of the forms is quite regular in all books except Deuteronomy, II Kings and Ezra. In Deuteronomy, in which there are but 12 forms, only one-sixth of the forms are Perfects with waw, in II Kings about one-fourth of the forms are Imperfects, and in Ezra only 1 of the 7 forms is an Imperfect. The paucity of forms in Deuteronomy renders it quite impossible to attach any particular significance to tense use there. The 42 Perfects with waw in II Kings--twice as many as in I Kings--arrest our attention. Are many of these and other Perfects with waw which do not with ease fit the incomplete aspect idea "beruhen...auf dem Einfluss aramäischer Redeweise,"<sup>1</sup> or are they due rather to the type of construction itself? It appears that those who adhere to the view of Aramaic influence have found what they think is a solution to the problem. Now it may be that the Aramaic dialect does come under consideration in Ezra, which has Aramaic sections. But it should be noted that many of the Perfects with waw, notably in II Kings, are located in passages where a king is mentioned by name and then his activities are enumerated, e.g. in II Kings Chapter 23, King Josiah's reform:

---

<sup>1</sup>W. Gesenius, Hebräische Grammatik, edited by E. Kautzsch (27th ed.; Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1902), p. 340.

(ver. 4) "And the king (Josiah) commanded Hilkiah...  
to bring out from the temple of the LORD  
all the vessels.... (ver. 5) And he (Josiah)  
removed (w<sup>h</sup>išbît) the...priests....(ver. 8)  
And he broke down (w<sup>n</sup>ātag) the high places....  
(ver. 10) And he defiled (w<sup>o</sup>limmē') the To-  
phet.... (ver. 14) And he broke in pieces  
(w<sup>o</sup>šibbar) the images"

Evidently the waw in verses 5, 8, 10 and 14 points back to the noun "king" in verse 4, and thus has a demonstrative force. It is apparently employed as an equivalent of a separate personal pronoun before the verb form. In II Kings Chapter 18 verse 4, for example, the separate personal pronoun appears before a Perfect; and the following verb forms are Perfects with waw: "He (hū') removed (hēsār)... and broke in pieces (w<sup>o</sup>šibbar)...and cut down (w<sup>o</sup>kārat)... and crushed fine (w<sup>o</sup>kittat)."<sup>1</sup> In this verse the conjunctions waw carry on the idea of the initial particle (the separate personal pronoun) as connectives. The Perfects with waw in both these sections seem to have a special force, and this may be the very reason for their appearance.<sup>1</sup> The latter passage has perplexed the aspectual theorists: "Allenfalls noch  $\neg \text{כ} \text{ו}$  , nicht aber  $\neg \text{כ} \text{ו}$  etc. frequentativ gefasst werden könnte; offenbar sind die Perf. ganz äusserlich dem  $\neg \text{כ} \text{ו}$   $\neg \text{כ} \text{ו}$  koordiniert...."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>It may be that the nature of the context, which is not strict narration, determines the use of the Perfects with waw. But it seems preferable to seek the reason in the kind of construction itself; for elsewhere the character of the construction seems to be the reason for its use.

<sup>2</sup>Gesenius-Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 341.

Certainly a straight past signification for all the forms is much easier to suppose. There is a co-ordination of meaning as well as of form.

#### K. Concentrations of verb forms:

That the verb forms are often found in concentrations is clearly shown by the following statistics:

1. Exodus Chap. 33 (20 forms in 5 verses: 6 Imperfs., 14 Perfs. with waw)
2. Numbers Chap. 9 (25 forms in 9 verses: 20 Imperfs., 5 Perfs. with waw)
3. I Samuel Chaps. 1 and 2 (at least 18 forms, excluding the poetic portion: 8 Imperfs., 10 Perfs. with waw)
4. II Kings Chap. 12 (11 forms in 9 verses: 8 Imperfs., 3 Perfs. with waw)
5. In 6 verses of I Chronicles Chap. 9 are located 5 of the 16 forms in the entire book: 4 Imperfs., 1 Perf. with waw)

The question should be asked: Is there any significance in such concentrations? In this connection, it is to be noted that the archaic *Nūn* ending with the Imperfect is also found in clusters, e.g. Deuteronomy 12:1-4; I Samuel 2:22,23.<sup>1</sup> Therefore it would seem that concentrations of the forms, as well as the kind of construction, mark the Imperfects as archaisms.

#### II. Examples of usage:

From our viewpoint, slightly over 60% of the verbal forms can readily be construed in an iterative or incomplete sense; but this means that

---

<sup>1</sup>This ancient termination called *Nūn paragogicum* is preserved in classical Arabic (*yaqtulūna*): see W. Wright, Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages (Cambridge: University Press, 1890), p.184. We may speculate that there are earlier and later types of the Imperfect in future time and that the forms before us, with the overhanging *Nūn* (Deut. 12:1-4), are hang-overs from the earlier type. This would involve further research, however, and therefore might provide material for a later dissertation.

almost 30% of the forms are not well-suited to this sense. If there were merely a few isolated forms that did not fit the aspectual theorists' view, one would have little reason to doubt the validity of their theory; but when nearly one-third of the forms do not seem to fit the pattern, then one has the right to question with vehemence its validness. Then too if the 60% can in general be construed in a sense other than frequentative, the argument against the aspect theory receives additional support.

With these facts in mind, we shall now examine a number of passages which it is hoped will show the fallacies of the aspectual view and at the same time support our position:

A. Verb forms with the particle  $\text{לֹא}$  and its equivalents:

1. With  $\text{לֹא}$  alone:

I Kings 3:16 "Then ('āz) two women came (ṭābō' nāh)...and stood (wattā' amōdnāh)"

That the Imperfect with the particle  $\text{לֹא}$  is a straight past tense seems to be supported by this example. The simple Imperfect is followed by the Imperfect with waw consecutive, and both forms are in construction with the particle  $\text{לֹא}$ . These Imperfects are evidently one and the same form.

2. With  $\text{לֹא}$  and an additional time-determination:

II Kings 8:22 // II Chronicles 21:10 "Then ('āz) Libnah rebelled (tipšā') at that time (pā'et hahî')"

Here is a temporal phrase along with the temporal particle, and with identical meaning. With this in mind, we may examine forms of similar import:

a) Joshua 9:27 "Then made them (wayyittēnēm) Joshua in that day (bayyôm hahî')"

- b) I Kings 13:3 "Then he gave (wēnātan) in that day (bayyôm hahû')"

There seems to be little doubt that the Perfect with waw in b is used exactly like the Imperfect with waw in a, and that both are used like the simple Imperfect with  $\text{לֹא}$  in II Kings 8:22. Hence all are probably straight past tenses.

3. With waw equivalent to  $\text{לֹא}$  :

- a) Genesis 15:5,6 "And He said to him: Thus shall be your seed. Then he believed (wēhe'emin) in the LORD, and He reckoned it to him for righteousness. And He said to him"

The verse in which the Perfect with waw appears is bracketed by verses in which God speaks to Abram. Hence Abram's act of faith seems to have occurred at that moment. G. R. Driver is without doubt wrong when he says that "the Hebrew perfect tense clearly describes a more or less lasting state, i.e. it marks Abraham's belief as a continuous state, in contrast with the definite act whereby it was reckoned to him for righteousness."<sup>1</sup> It is justifying faith, i.e. faith by which Abram was declared righteous, an instantaneous act, which is under consideration here, as proved by the New Testament (Rom. 4:3). Both the New Testament and the LXX use the aorist tense ( $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$ ). It is a momentary act--a straight (aoristic) past tense.

- b) I Samuel 13:19 "Then (i.e. in those days) a smith was not found (yimmāsē') in all the land"

---

<sup>1</sup>G. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 129.



The Imperfect is the first verb in a section which describes conditions at that time, and is in construction with the conjunction *waw* (rendered "then"), which begins the section. This verb form probably expresses a simple statement of fact. It is true that the LXX uses the imperfect tense (*ἐϋρίεκετο*) to translate the verb, but it also uses an imperfect (*κατέβαινον*) to translate the Imperfect with *waw* consecutive which begins verse 20.

- c) II Kings 25:27-29 // Jeremiah 52:31-33 "In the twelfth month, on the twenty and seven (day) to the month, lifted up Evil-merodach...the head of Jehoiachin... from a house of imprisonment. Then (i.e. on that day) he spoke (*way<sup>e</sup>dabbēr*) with him good things and set (*wayyittēn*) his throne from above the throne of the kings who were with him in Babylon, and changed (*w<sup>e</sup>šinnā'*) his prison garments"

On the twenty-seventh day of the month Evil-merodach spoke with Jehoiachin good things and set his throne above the throne of the kings and changed his prison garments. Thus Evil-merodach spoke...set...and changed on that day (the twenty-seventh day of the twelfth month). It was not Jehoiachin who changed his prison garments as some assert. The verb

*שָׁנָה* is in the Piel stem (theme) and has a causative force. Hence it was Evil-merodach who "made different" Jehoiachin's garments, i.e. he caused one type of garment to give way to another, or he substituted one type of garment for another. It is the kindness of Evil-merodach, manifested in his actions of speaking, setting and changing, that is under consideration.

The *waw* with the first underlined Imperfect is rendered "then" and is used in construction with the two verbs in verse 28 and the first verb in verse 29. The Perfect with *waw* therefore

expresses the action in the same way as the Imperfects with waw consecutive: all are straight past tenses.

- d) II Chronicles 15:5,6 "And in those times there was no peace to him who went out and to him who came in, for great disturbances (were) upon all the inhabitants of the countries. Then (i.e. in those times) were dashed (w<sup>o</sup>kutt<sup>u</sup>tu) nation against nation and city against city, for God disquieted them with every adversity"

In these verses are expressed parallel ideas: "in those times there was no peace...for" and "then were dashed...for." It is clear then that the waw (with the Perfect) carries on the temporal idea, i.e. "in those times...then."

The Perfect with waw expresses the action in the same manner as the verb in the next clause. Thus if the nations "were dashed" repeatedly it was because God "disquieted" them repeatedly. But the verb in the following clause is a simple Perfect. Hence both forms are best viewed as straight past tenses.

4. With waw equivalent to  $\text{לְכֵן}$ , followed by an additional time-determination:

- a) Genesis 38:5 "And she bore a son and she called his name Shelah. Then he (i.e. Judah) was (w<sup>o</sup>hāyāh) in Chezib when she bore (b<sup>o</sup>liddah) him"

The expression "then he was in Chezib when she bore him" is similar to the expression "then rebelled Libnah at that time" (II Kings 8:22), where the simple Imperfect occurs with the particle  $\text{לְכֵן}$  expressed.

In Genesis 38:5 the words "she bore" are repeated. Therefore the verse may be paraphrased thus: "And she bore

a son whose name she called Shelah. At that time Judah was in Chezib." The LXX alters the Perfect into a feminine demonstrative pronoun ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ ) and thus makes it relate to Shuah instead of to Judah. But this is both arbitrary and unnecessary.

b) I Kings 9:25 "Then Solomon offered (w<sup>he</sup>e<sup>e</sup>lāh) three times in the year (šālōš p<sup>o</sup>āmīn baššānāh)"

In the parallel verse (II Chronicles 8:12) there occurs a simple Perfect with the particle  $\text{לִּ$  expressed. However, the phrase "three times in the year" is wanting. The aspectual theorists would doubtless contend that the presence of the temporal phrase in I Kings shows that the Perfect with waw is to be taken in a frequentative sense,<sup>1</sup> and that the simple Perfect, as a straight past tense, is used in II Chronicles because the temporal phrase is wanting. But it is doubtful whether the temporal phrase affects verbal usage in this way.<sup>2</sup> Also, it is gratuitous to assume that the conjunction waw, any more than the particle  $\text{לִּ}$ , has the power to alter the force of the verb to which it is prefixed.<sup>3</sup> It is reasonable to suppose that the verb in Kings expresses the action in the same manner as its counterpart in the parallel verse. Hence we assert that both verbs are straight past tenses.

c) II Kings 13:20 "Then the bands of Moab came (yābō'û) into the land when the year came in (bā' šānāh)"

The Imperfect occurs in a context concerning the burial

---

<sup>1</sup>This is S. R. Driver's contention (op. cit., p. 144): "  $\text{לִּ$   $\text{לִּ$   $\text{לִּ$  used to offer (notice the words three times a year)."

<sup>2</sup>Infra, pp. 81-82.

<sup>3</sup>Supra, p. 22.

of Elisha and later of another man: "And Elisha died and they buried him. And the bands of Moab came into the land when the year came in. Thus it was: as they buried a man, then behold, they saw the band...." It is a particular historical setting that is considered. So it seems reasonable to assume that the bands of Moab came into the land at the beginning of the year following Elisha's death. The spirit of the context disallows a frequentative signification. A straight past is the only sense in keeping with the context.

- d) Ezra 9:4 "Then to me were gathered (yē'āsēpū) every one who revered the words of the God of Israel... while I sat (wa'anī yōšēb) appalled"

The Imperfect as a frequentative is unsuitable. A progressive past could be considered. This is S. R. Driver's view: "came gathering to me."<sup>1</sup> But this is seen to be quite unnecessary when the Imperfect is viewed in construction with the other elements of the idiom. If the initial waw is the equivalent of the particle  $\text{וְ}$ , which appears to be most logical, the construction is equated with the idiom of  $\text{וְ}$  with the Imperfect. Few to-day would doubt that the Imperfect in the latter idiom is a straight past tense. Therefore it would seem to be so in the former also.

5. With a temporal adverb equivalent to  $\text{וְ}$ :

- I Samuel 9:9 "For to the prophet to-day was given the name (yiqqārē') formerly (lepanīm) the seer"

The expression might be paraphrased thus: "for to the prophet now was given the name then the seer." Therefore "to-day" and "formerly" = "now" ( $\text{הַיּוֹם}$ ) and "then" ( $\text{וְ}$ ). Note in this connection Isaiah 1:21: "(Then) righteousness

---

<sup>1</sup>S. R. Driver, ibid., p. 33.

lodged (yālîn) in it, and now murderers."

One need not construe these verbs in a frequentative sense: "used to be called" and "used to lodge." Probably it is the particular type of construction that marks these verb forms as archaisms. Hence they are most likely straight past tenses.

B. Forms with waw equivalent  $\text{w}^{\text{e}}\text{w}$ :

II Kings 25:27-29 // Jeremiah 52:31-33 "In the twelfth month, on the twenty and seven (day) to the month, lifted up Evil-merodach...the head of Jehoiachin...from a house of imprisonment. Then he spoke with him good things and set his throne from above the throne of the kings who were with him in Babylon, and changed his prison garments. Thenceforth he (i.e. Jehoiachin) ate (w<sup>e</sup>'ākal) food continually before him all the days of his life"

Our rendering "thenceforth" seems to be warranted by the context: from that time forward (i.e. from the day in which Evil-merodach showed kindness towards him) Jehoiachin ate food at the king's table until his death. The Perfect with waw could be construed in a frequentative sense. Of course the concept "to eat," quite apart from the form of the verb, lends itself to this idea, as does also the adverb "continually." But it is our contention that these factors do not affect the verbal action; in fact, the verbal action would be the same even if they were not present, i.e. it would still have an aoristic past signification.

It is our impression that the waw is a flexible particle. That is, it can be employed in the place of other

particles. Now the particle  $\text{וְ}$  is of infrequent use. Hence the waw can readily function in its stead. Further, there appear to be numerous other instances of the waw's employment as a temporal particle. Thus the Perfect with the waw employed as a temporal particle corresponds in usage to the Imperfect with temporal particles such as  $\text{וְ}$ .

C. Forms with the particle  $\text{וְ}$  and its equivalents:

1. With  $\text{וְ}$  expressed:

- a) Numbers 9:17 "And in the place where the cloud abode, there (šām) the sons of Israel encamped (yahēnū)"
- b) II Kings 6:10 "And the king of Israel sent to the place about which the man of God had told and warned him, and he was on his guard (wēnišmar) there (šām) not once and not twice"

2. With  $\text{וְ}$  suppressed:

- a) I Samuel 14:47 "And wherever he turned, (there) he inflicted punishment (yaršī'a)"
- b) II Kings 18:7 "Wherever he went out, (there) he was successful (yāskīl)"

3. With waw equivalent to  $\text{וְ}$ :

Exodus 33:6,7 "And the sons of Israel pulled off their ornaments from (i.e. a short distance from) Mount Horeb. There Moses took (yiqqah) the tent and pitched (wēnātāh) it"

4. With a local phrase equivalent to  $\text{וְ}$ :

- a) I Kings 5:28 "And he sent them to Lebanon ten thousand in the month in relays: a month they were

(yihyû) in Lebanon (ball<sup>c</sup>bānôn), two months in his house"

The word "Lebanon" is repeated. Hence "in Lebanon" = in that place = there. So the verse may be rendered as follows: "And he sent them to Lebanon ten thousand in the month in relays: a month they were there, two months in his house."

b) I Kings 12:32 "Thus he did in Bethel to sacrifice to the calves which he had made. And he placed (w<sup>c</sup>he'omîd) in Bethel (b<sup>c</sup>bêt 'ēl) the priests of the high places"

The phrase "in Bethel" is repeated. Thus "in Bethel" = in that place = there. Therefore the verse may be rendered as follows: "Thus he did in Bethel to sacrifice to the calves which he had made. And he placed there the priests of the high places."

Note in this connection Jeremiah 41:1: "In the seventh month came Ishmael...and ten men with him to Gedaliah...to Mizpah, and they ate (wayyō'k<sup>c</sup>ēlû) there (šām) food together in Mizpah (hammispāh)"

Not only is the noun "Mizpah" repeated but also the particle ו occurs as well. So it would be rendered thus: "And they ate there in that place food."

It is true that most of these verbs could be construed in an iterative sense, but in Exodus 33:7 the simple Imperfect and the Perfect with waw, as we have viewed them, cannot be so construed. Also, in Jeremiah 41:1 an Imperfect with waw consecutive is used in a similar type of construction. Hence it seems

that the verb forms are to be taken as straight past tenses in construction with the particle  $\text{וְ}$  or its equivalents.

D. Forms with the particle  $\text{וְ}$  and its equivalent:

1. With  $\text{וְ}$  expressed:

II Kings 12:10 "And Jehoiada the priest took a chest and bored a hole in its lid and set it beside the altar...and the priests put (wenātenû) thither (šāmnāh) all the money"

2. With a local phrase equivalent to  $\text{וְ}$ :

- a) Joshua 17:10 "And to Asher (ūb<sup>e</sup>āšēr) they reached (yipg<sup>e</sup>ūn) on the north"

This example indicates that local phrases influence verbal usage in the same way as local particles.<sup>1</sup> We view the verb as an archaism; it even has the archaic Nun ending.<sup>2</sup>

- b) Joshua 19:34 "And it reached (ūpāga<sup>e</sup>) to Zebulun (bizbulūn) on the south, and to Asher (ūb<sup>e</sup>āšēr) it reached (pāga<sup>e</sup>) on the west"

Apparently the Perfect with waw and the simple Perfect are used identically. Further, they seem to be used exactly like the simple Imperfect in example a. Hence all the forms are probably straight past tenses.

The Perfect with waw in II Kings 12:10 could very easily be construed as a frequentative, but the Imperfect in Joshua 17:10 and the Perfect with waw in Joshua 19:34 can only with extreme difficulty be so construed. It seems easier to view all forms as preterites in construction with locative elements.

<sup>1</sup>Infra, pp. 43-44.

<sup>2</sup>Supra, p. 28.



E. Forms with particle  $\text{וְ}$  and its equivalents:

1. With  $\text{וְ}$  expressed:

- a) Genesis 2:10 "And thence (ūmiššām) it separated (yippārēd) and became (wēhāyāh) into four heads"<sup>1</sup>.
- b) Joshua 18:13 "And the boundary passed along (wēābar) thence (miššām) towards Luz"<sup>2</sup>.
- c) Joshua 19:34 "And it went out (wēvāsā) thence (miššām) to Hukkok"

Note also Joshua 19:13 "And thence (ūmiššām) it passed along (ābar) towards the east"

The Imperfect and the Perfect with waw in Genesis 2:10 could be construed iteratively, but the Perfects with waw in Joshua 18:13 and 19:34 can hardly be thus construed. Then, too, the simple Perfect in Joshua 19:13 is obviously employed in the same way as the Perfects with waw in Joshua 18:13 and 19:34. Consequently all the forms in Joshua are best viewed as preterites. Now if the Perfects with waw in Joshua are preterites, it would seem that the Perfect with waw in Genesis 2:10 is also a preterite; and if the Perfect with waw in Genesis is a preterite, so is the Imperfect preceding it. Therefore we may assume that all the forms are straight past tenses in construction with the local particle  $\text{וְ}$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Supra, p. 21 (fn).

<sup>2</sup>S. R. Driver (*ibid.*, p. 145) gives the form "a frequentative force, descriptive of the course which the boundary used to take--used to take, namely..., whenever any one passed along it...." Such an explanation brings out in relief the untenability of the aspect theory.

2. With  $\text{זו}$  suppressed:

- a) Exodus 33:8 "When Moses went out to the tent, all the people arose and stood, every man at the door of his tent. And (thence) they looked after (w<sup>h</sup>ibbîtu) Moses until he went into the tent"
- b) II Kings 24:13,14,15 "And he brought out (wayyôse') thence (miššām) all the treasures.... And (thence) he carried away into exile (w<sup>h</sup>iglāh) all Jerusalem.... And (thence) he carried away into exile (wayyegel) Jehoiachin"
- c) II Kings 14:13,14 "And they came to Jerusalem.... And he took (w<sup>l</sup>āqah) (thence) all the gold..., and he returned (wayyāšob) to Samaria"
- d) II Kings 23:4 "And he burned them outside Jerusalem in the fields of Kidron. And (thence) he carried (w<sup>n</sup>āsā') their ashes to Bethel"

In these examples, the Perfect with waw in Exodus 33:8 could have a frequentative force; but the Perfects with waw in II Kings cannot have this force. In II Kings 24:13-15 it is obvious that the Perfect with waw corresponds in usage to the Imperfects with waw consecutive by which it is bracketed. Verses 14 and 15 carry on the thought introduced in verse 13, i.e. "And he brought out thence.... And (thence) he carried away into exile.... And (thence) he carried away into exile...."

The Perfect with waw in II Kings 14:14 is used like the Imperfect with waw consecutive in I Kings 9:28: "And they came to Opher and took (wayyiq<sup>h</sup>û) thence (miššām) gold." And this is not all. This Perfect with waw in the expression "and he took (thence)" is followed by a similar expression "and he returned to Samaria" in which an Imperfect with waw consecutive is used. The Imperfects with waw consecutive establish the preteritive use of the Perfect with

waw. For even further confirmation of the preterite usage of the Perfect with waw we might cite II Samuel 8:6,7: "And David put garrisons in Aram-Damneseq.... And David took (wayyiqqah) (thence) shields of gold...and brought them (way<sup>e</sup>bi<sup>'</sup>ēm) to Jerusalem." In this example we have an Imperfect with waw consecutive used in the first clause as well as in the second clause, and both clauses correspond to those in II Kings 14:14, where the Perfect with waw is used in the first clause and an Imperfect with waw consecutive is used in the second clause.

Now the Perfect with waw in II Kings 23:4 can in this light easily be seen as a preterite also. So we have established the preteritive use of all the Perfects with waw in II Kings. This leaves only the Perfect with waw in Exodus 33:8. Now since it is employed in a similar construction, at least from our viewpoint, we posit a straight past signification for it as well.

3. With a local phrase equivalent to וְשִׁי :

- a) Exodus 40:30,31: "And he set the laver between the tent of the assembly and between the altar, and he put thither water for washing. And Moses and Aaron and his sons washed (w<sup>e</sup>rāh<sup>a</sup>sū) from it (mimmennū)"

The phrase "from it" = from the laver = from that laver = from that place = thence.

- b) Joshua 16:1,2 "And the lot of the sons of Joseph came out from Jordan by Jericho, at the waters of Jericho eastward, to the wilderness, going up from Jericho into the mountain-region to Bethel. And it went out (w<sup>e</sup>yāsā') from Bethel (mibbē<sup>t</sup>'ēl) towards Luz"

The word "Bethel" is repeated. Hence "from Bethel" = from that place = thence.

e) I Kings 17:5,6 "And he went and dwelt by the brook Cherith, which is by the face of the Jordan. (And the ravens brought to him bread and flesh in the morning and bread and flesh in the evening). And from the brook (ūmin hannahal) he drank (yišteh)"

The word "brook" is repeated. Thus "from the brook" = from that brook = from that place = thence. The parenthetical section is a circumstantial clause.

The Perfect with waw in Exodus 40 and the simple Imperfect in I Kings 17 could denote repetitious action, but it is unlikely that the Perfect with waw in Joshua 16 can have such a denotation. At this point it would not be impertinent to cite I Kings 10:28,29: "And the going out of the horses which (were) for Solomon from Egypt.... And went up (watta'aleh) and went out (wattēse') a chariot from Egypt (minmisrayim)." In this example the phrase "from Egypt" is repeated. Hence "from Egypt" = from that place = thence. The verbs in construction with this locative phrase are Imperfects with waw consecutive. But it is to be noted that these Imperfects with waw consecutive are bracketed by two simple Imperfects, viz.  $\text{וַיֵּלֶךְ}$  in verse 28 and  $\text{וַיֵּצֵא}$  in verse 29. If the simple Imperfects are to be construed as frequentatives, the Imperfects with waw consecutive can hardly be construed otherwise. The presence of Imperfects with waw consecutive in the midst of simple Imperfects argues not only against aspectual distinctions but also against a frequentative use for the simple Imperfects. The simple Imperfects as well as the Imperfects with waw consecutive are probably remnants of an old preterite tense of the preformative type. Now in the light of these remarks it would seem that the simple Imperfect in I Kings 17:6 is also a vestige of an old preterite tense. It appears in a construction similar to that in which the Imperfects with waw consecutive appear in I Kings 10:29. The Perfect

with waw in Exodus 40:31, being in the same type of construction, is also most appropriately viewed as a preterite tense.

F. Forms with other local phrases:

1. With the phrase "from Egypt":

Judges 2:1 "I brought you up ('a'aleh) from Egypt (mimmisrayim) and brought (wā'āhī') you into the land"

Although a simple Imperfect is found in the first clause and an Imperfect with waw consecutive in the second clause, the clauses are parallel: "I brought you up from...and brought you into." Therefore, sound reasoning demands the identical usage of the two verbal forms. A lacuna is postulated by some as an endeavour to meet the exigencies of the aspect theory. But this is due to unwarranted presuppositions. S. R. Driver sees the Imperfect as "setting forth the occurrence in bright relief,"<sup>1</sup> in the sense of our historical present. But the "bringing in" would be as much in relief as the "bringing out." Driver's distinction is superficial. Anything short of a straight past signification for both forms will hardly satisfy.

It seems best to view the use of the constructions in the light of the examples in sections D and E above. The simple Imperfect is followed by the local phrase "from Egypt"; the Imperfect with waw consecutive is followed by the local phrase "into the land." These phrases are similar to the "thence-thither" or "thence-hither" combination. So it may be advanced that local phrases influence verbal usage in a way much like local particles. That this is possible may be shown from a verse in the prophetic section: Hosea 12:5 "In Bethel (bēt 'ēl)

---

<sup>1</sup>S. R. Driver, *ibid.*, p. 32.

he found him (yimsā'ennû), and there (w<sup>o</sup>šām) He spoke (y<sup>e</sup>dabbēr) with us." If the local particle "there" influences the verb, so does the local phrase "in Bethel." Both verb forms are preterites of the preformative type.

2. With the phrase "at all these places":

I Samuel 7:16 "And he went as often as year by year and went round to Bethel and Gilgal and Mizpah, and he judged (w<sup>o</sup>šāpat) Israel at all these places ('ēt kol hamm<sup>o</sup>qômôt hā'ēlleh)"

3. With the phrase "upon the altar":

I Kings 3:4 "And the king went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for it was the great high place. A thousand burnt offerings Solomon offered (ya<sup>a</sup>leh) upon that altar ('al hammizbēha hahû')"

4. With the phrase "into the brook Kidron":

II Kings 23:12 "And he ran (wayyāros) thence (miššām) and threw (w<sup>e</sup>hišlîk) their dust into the brook Kidron ('el nahal qidrôn)"

The Imperfect with waw consecutive is followed by the local particle "thence", and the Perfect with waw is followed by the local phrase "into the brook Kidron." There is a clear parallelism: he ran from a place and threw into a place. Hence one might almost say: "and he ran thence and threw thither."

5. With the phrase "round about the house of God":

I Chronicles 9:26,27 "And they were over the chambers and over the treasures of the house of God. And round about the house of God (ūs<sup>o</sup>bîbôt bêt hā'elōhîm) they lodged (yālînû)"

The phrase "house of God" is repeated. Thus one may render the first clause in verse 27 as follows:

"And round about that house they lodged."

Of these examples the Perfect with waw in I Samuel 7 and the simple Imperfects in I Kings 3 and I Chronicles 9 can take a frequentative force, but the simple Imperfect in Judges 2 and the Perfect with waw in II Kings 23 cannot take this force. These two latter forms refer not only to a single action but also are parallel with an Imperfect with waw consecutive. This shows that the forms are to be viewed as preterites. The three other forms, used as they are in similar constructions, in all probability are also to be held as preterites.

G. Forms with the relative adverb  $\neg\psi\times$  (used temporally "when"):

1. With  $\neg\psi\times$  expressed:

- a) Genesis 6:4 "And also after this, when ('ašer) the sons of God came in (yābō'û) to the daughters of men"
- b) Genesis 30:38 "And he set the rods which he had peeled ... in the watering troughs, when ('ašer) the sheep came (tābō'nā) to drink, in front of the sheep" <sup>1</sup>
- c) Numbers 9:18 "All the days when ('ašer) the cloud abode (yiškōn) upon the tabernacle"
- d) Numbers 9:20,21 "And there was when ('ašer) there was (yihyeh) the cloud"
- e) II Samuel 14:26 "And when he shaved his head, and it was at the end of every year when ('ašer) he shaved (y<sup>e</sup>gallēha)"

---

<sup>1</sup> The relative clause could be translated: "where the sheep came to drink," as in the R.V. and R.S.V. We have followed the A.V.

It is true that in each of these examples the Imperfect can be construed in an iterative sense. But the question is: Must they be taken in this sense? All the verbs are in the same type of construction, so it is not unreasonable to assume that through common use the idiom became stereotyped. So what we have may well be an idiom which finds its roots in the common speech of an early stratum. If this be true, these are without doubt archaisms.

2. With waw equivalent to  $\text{ו} \text{ } \psi \text{ } \times$ :

- a) Genesis 29:3 "And they rolled away the stone from upon the mouth of the well, when they watered (w<sup>h</sup>išqû) the sheep, and put the stone back upon the mouth of the well"
- b) I Samuel 13:20,21 "And all Israel went down to the Philistines to sharpen every man his plowshare..., when there was (w<sup>h</sup>ay<sup>o</sup>tāh) the bluntness of edges to the plowshares..., and to set the goads"<sup>1</sup>
- c) II Samuel 19:18,19 "And they rushed to the Jordan before the king, when the ferry-boat crossed over (w<sup>o</sup>(āb<sup>o</sup>rāh)), to bring over the household of the king"
- d) II Kings 11:1 "And (as for) Athaliah the mother of Ahaziah, when she saw (w<sup>o</sup>rā'atāh, following the Kethîbh) that her son was dead, she arose"<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The text is difficult, but we believe that the R.V. (American Standard Version) footnote gives the idea: "when the edges of the mattocks...and of the axes were blunt." This is supported by the "Elberfelder Bibel": "wenn die Schneiden an den Sicheln...abgestumpft waren...." and by the "Version Synodale": "quand le tranchant des socs...s'ébréçait...."

<sup>2</sup>C. F. Keil (Biblischer Commentar über die Prophetischen Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1865), p. 265) also contends that  $\text{ו} \text{ } \psi \text{ } \times$  introduces a circumstantial clause: "Athalia--als sie sah dass...machte sich auf."



The underlined verb in Genesis 29 and I Samuel 13 could be construed with an iterative force, but not the verb in II Samuel 19 and II Kings 11. The verb in II Samuel 19 could have a progressive force, but only for want of a better explanation. The Perfect with waw in each case introduces a circumstantial clause. Hence it is probably the type of construction, rather than the kind of verbal action, which determines the usage of the forms.

H. Forms with the relative adverb  $\gamma \psi \underline{\chi}$  (used locally "where"):

1. With  $\gamma \psi \underline{\chi}$  expressed:

Deuteronomy 11:10 "Not as the land of Egypt (is) it,  
whence you came out, where (ʿāḡer) you sowed  
(tizraʿ) your seed and irrigated (w<sup>h</sup>iṣqātā)  
with your foot"

Both verb forms are in construction with the relative adverb  $\gamma \psi \underline{\chi}$ , and apparently it is the character of the construction which determines the use of the forms. Hence it is to be doubted that Aktionsart comes under consideration at all. The verbal action can be viewed in the sense of the Greek "constative" aorist which "treats the act as a single whole entirely irrespective of the parts or time involved."<sup>1</sup>

2. With waw equivalent to  $\gamma \psi \underline{\chi}$ :

a) Exodus 33:9 "When Moses entered the tent, the pillar of cloud came down and stood at the door of the tent, where He spoke (w<sup>h</sup>dibber) with Moses"<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (4th ed; Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 832.

<sup>2</sup>The Berkeley Version translates the waw locally, but gives the verb a frequentative signification: "where He would converse with Moses."

- b) Compare I Kings 18:4. "When Jezebel cut off the prophets of the LORD, then Obadiah took an hundred prophets and hid them (by) fifty in the cave, where he supplied them (w<sup>o</sup>kilk<sup>o</sup>lām) with food" with verse 13 "Was it not declared to my lord that which I did when Jezebel killed the prophets of the LORD, the fact that I hid some of the prophets of the LORD...in the cave, where I supplied them (wā'<sup>o</sup>kalk<sup>o</sup>lām) with food"

In these examples the Perfect with waw in Exodus 33:9 and I Kings 18:4 can readily denote iteration, but the fact that an Imperfect with waw consecutive is employed in I Kings 18:13 in a way comparable to the latter militates against a frequentative use. In view of the correspondent constructions and the presence of the Imperfect with waw consecutive, it seems best to suppose a straight past sense for all the forms.

3. With  $\text{ז} \psi \dots \text{ז} \psi \text{X}$  combination:

- a) Numbers 9:17 "And in the place where (ʔa<sup>y</sup>ser) the cloud abode (yiškon) (šām)"
- b) II Samuel 15:32 "David came to the summit where (ʔa<sup>y</sup>ser) he (or "one") worshipped (yištah<sup>a</sup>weh) (šām)"
- c) I Kings 5:8 "They brought to the place where (ʔa<sup>y</sup>ser) he was (yihyeh) (šām)"
- d) I Kings 7:7 "And a porch for the throne where (ʔa<sup>y</sup>ser) he judged (yišpoṭ) (šām)"<sup>1</sup>
- e) I Kings 7:8a "And his house where (ʔa<sup>y</sup>ser) he dwelt (yēšeb) (šām)"<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The R.S.V., following the LXX, renders the verb in the future; but we believe that a future signification is less in keeping with the historic setting.

The verbs in each of these examples, except possibly II Samuel 15:32, could be construed in an iterative-durative sense. But it is our impression that they are used in a way similar to those with the relative adverb in Sections G.1. and H.1. above. Hence the kind of construction marks these forms as archaisms.

4. With *waw* in combination with a local phrase as an equivalent of  $\text{וַיֵּשׁ} \dots \text{וַיֵּשׁ} \text{X}$ :

- a) II Samuel 15:37 "And Hushai, the friend of David, went (wayyābō<sup>1</sup>) to the city; and Absalom came (yābō<sup>2</sup>) to Jerusalem (y<sup>e</sup>rušālām)"

In this verse both verbs are from the root *Xil*.

Some versions follow the LXX:  $\kappa\alpha\iota \text{ } \alpha\beta\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\lambda\omega\mu \text{ } \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota \text{ } \epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{ } \epsilon\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\omicron \text{ } \epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{ } \text{Ιε\rho\rho\upsilon\sigma\alpha\lambda\acute{\eta}\mu}$  "and Absalom at this time was going into Jerusalem." For example, the R.S.V. reads: "just as Absalom was entering Jerusalem." Thus the verb is construed progressively.

We should note, however, that the "city" to which Hushai went was Jerusalem (note vv. 29, 34 and 35). So both Hushai and Absalom went to Jerusalem, but not at the same time. The above versions seem to have overlooked the fact that Absalom's entrance into Jerusalem is recorded in the following chapter (Chap. 16, ver. 15). Hence Hushai came first to the city. S.R. Driver realized this, but his rendering of the simple Imperfect is forced: "went on to enter." <sup>1</sup>

The *waw* beginning the second clause appears to be an equivalent of the relative  $\text{וַיֵּשׁ} \text{X}$ . Also, as stated above, the "city" is "Jerusalem." Therefore, the verse could be

<sup>1</sup> S.R. Driver, op. cit., p. 33.

rendered thus: "And Hushai, the friend of David, went to the city, whither Absalom came."

Breakdown: i. and Absalom came to Jerusalem  
 ii. and Absalom came to that place  
 iii. which Absalom came thither  
 iv. whither Absalom came

An aoristic (straight) past signification is well-suited to both verb forms.

b) Nehemiah 13:1 "On that day there was read in the book of Moses in the ears of the people, and it was found (w<sup>e</sup>nimsā') written in it (bô)"

The waw appears to be equivalent to  $\neg \psi \chi$  "which," and this waw and the local phrase "in it" compounded can be rendered "where."

Breakdown: i. and it was found written in it  
 ii. which it was found written in it  
 iii. in which it was found written  
 iv. where it was found written

This is clearly a straight past tense.

5. With waw in combination with the particle  $\neg \psi \psi$  as an equivalent of  $\neg \psi \psi \dots \neg \psi \chi$ :

Genesis 29:2,3 "And the stone was great upon the mouth of the well, and were gathered (w<sup>e</sup>ne'esepû) thither (šāmmāh) all the flocks"

The waw is apparently equivalent to  $\neg \psi \chi$  "which," and this waw and the particle "thence" compounded can be rendered "whither."

Breakdown: i. and were gathered thither  
 ii. which were gathered thither  
 iii. whither were gathered

One could contend that the verb has a frequentative

force, but in the light of the two immediately preceding examples it also would seem to be a straight past tense.

I. Forms with the relative  $\text{ל} \text{ש} \text{ל}$  ("who, which") or its equivalent:<sup>1</sup>

1. With  $\text{ל} \text{ש} \text{ל}$  expressed:

a) Numbers 11:5 "We remember the fish which ('ašer) we ate (nō'kal) in Egypt"

b) Judges 9:38 "And Zebul said to him: Where (is) now your mouth, who ('ašer) said (tō'mar): Who (is) Abimelech, that we should serve him"

The words "who said" probably refer to Gaal's utterance in verse 28, and not to a series of utterances.

c) II Samuel 15:2 "Any man who ('ašer) there was (yihyeh) to him a cause"

d) II Samuel 15:6 "And Absalom did according to this manner to all Israel who ('ašer) came (yābō'u) for judgment"

e) I Kings 8:5 // II Chronicles 5:6 "Sacrificing sheep and oxen which ('ašer) were not numbered (yissap<sup>e</sup>rū) and not counted (yimnānū) from multitude"

This is probably a simple statement of fact: "they could not be numbered," not a repetitive or distributive idea: "they could at no time (during the occasion) be numbered."

f) I Kings 10:5 // II Chronicles 9:4 "And his stairway (by)

---

<sup>1</sup>The relative may have been originally a demonstrative and not a mere nota relationis. See Gesenius-Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 451. Note also Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax, p. 145. For an extensive discussion see E. König, Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1895), 2nd half, Part I, pp. 323ff. For a treatment against an original  $\text{ל} \text{ש} \text{ל}$ , analogous to the Arabic  $\text{الذي}$ , see J. Barth, Die Pronominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1913), pp. 164-165.

which ('ašer) he went up (va<sup>a</sup>leh) to the house of the LORD"

- g) I Kings 11:9,10 "And the LORD was angry with Solomon because his heart had turned from with the Lord, the God of Israel, who had appeared (hannir<sup>a</sup>āh)<sup>1</sup> to him twice and had given charge (w<sup>a</sup>siwāh) to him concerning this thing"
- h) II Kings 6:10 "And the king of Israel sent to the place which ('ašer) the man of God had told ('amar) and warned him (w<sup>a</sup>hizhīrōh) about it"
- i) II Kings 8:29 "And Joram the king returned to be healed in Jezreel from the wounds with which ('ašer) the Syrians had wounded him (yakkūhū)"

One parallel verse, II Chronicles 22:6, has the Perfect; another, II Kings 9:15, has the Imperfect. As respects the appearance of the Imperfect in II Kings 8:29, A. B. Davidson says: "The preceding plur. 'wounds' perhaps distributes the verb wounded...."<sup>2</sup> It is to be doubted that the Imperfect can be taken in this way. The plural "wounds" is also used in II Chronicles 22:6, but there it is followed by the Perfect. Hence a straight past signification seems most suitable for all the forms, although the English idiom requires a pluperfect significance.

As mentioned previously, F.R. Blake places this Imperfect (II Kings 8:29) among the preteritive examples of the Imperfect forms; and he views it in construction with

7ψX.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The definite article, with the force of a relative, is prefixed to the verb.

<sup>2</sup>A. B. Davidson, Hebrew Syntax (3d ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901), p. 67.

<sup>3</sup>Supra, p. 21.

- j) II Kings 12:16 "And they did not reckon with the men who ('<sup>a</sup>šer) they gave (yitt<sup>e</sup>nû) the money into their hand"
- k) II Kings 19:33 "By the way which ('<sup>a</sup>šer) he came (yābō'), by it he shall return"

The parallel verse, Isaiah 37:34, uses the Perfect. A frequentative force in either instance is unsuitable. A progressive past in II Kings could be considered; however, a straight past signification would fit most appropriately. Furthermore, it is in line with the Perfect in the parallel verse.

- l) II Kings 25:14 // Jeremiah 52:18 "And all the vessels of bronze which ('<sup>a</sup>šer) they ministered (y<sup>e</sup>šār<sup>e</sup>û) with them, they took"
- m) Nehemiah 9:7,8 "Thou art He, the LORD, the God who ('<sup>a</sup>šer) chose (bāhartā) Abram and brought him (w<sup>e</sup>hōšē'tō) from Ur of the Chaldees and set (w<sup>e</sup>samtā) his name Abraham and found (ūmāsā'tā) his heart faithful"
- n) II Chronicles 33:19 "And the places which ('<sup>a</sup>šer) he built (bānāh) upon them high places and set up (w<sup>e</sup>he<sup>c</sup>emīd) the Asherim"

We admit that most of the simple Imperfects among these examples could be given a frequentative force, but there are at least two examples (II Kings 8:29 and 19:33 discussed above) which by no stretch of the imagination can be thus construed. These exceptions--if indeed they be exceptions--can argue against a frequentative use for the others. Then, too, the Perfects with waw (all of which follow simple Perfects) can from the aspectual viewpoint present a varied picture. For example, in

II Kings 6:10 the Perfect with waw could conform to the iterative pattern. But, on the other hand, the Perfects with waw in Nehemiah 9:7,8 can hardly be made to conform to that pattern. And further, if one supposes that the Perfect with waw in II Kings 6:10 has a frequentative force, what does one do with the simple Perfect which precedes it? From all appearances it must be taken in the same sense as the Perfect with waw which follows. Now how is one to disentangle oneself from these and similar involvements? The only feasible answer, as we see it, is to assume that there are no aspectual distinctions.

The extensive use of the relative particle  $\neg\psi\chi$ , both with the Imperfect and the Perfect, has raised doubts respecting its relevance as an influential element in verbal usage. We are aware that our contention regarding the influence of the relative on the use of the verb is by no means the strongest argument in support of our theory. If it were the only argument we had at our disposal, the theory would have little raison d'être. But we insist that our view cannot with propriety be thrown out of court without a hearing--if for no other reason than the fact that it is an explanation for the appearance of some Imperfects in past time which it appears have not been explained satisfactorily by other theories. Also, if it be admitted that  $\neg\psi\chi$ , when used as a relative adverb has an influence on verbal usage, it is only a short step towards its recognition as an element of influence in extenso.

It might not be out of place to cite two additional examples--one from the prophetic and the other from the poetic section--of an Imperfect in construction with the relative pronoun, where the idea of iteration is out of the question:

1. Isaiah 51:2 "Look to Abraham your father  
and to Sarah (who) bore you (t<sup>eh</sup>ôleleken)"



ii. Psalm 7:16 "And he has fallen into the pit (which) he made (yip<sup>c</sup>āl)"<sup>1</sup>

S. R. Driver takes the verb in the first example in the sense of our historical present, whereas in the second example it is given a force equivalent to that expressed by the Greek imperfect. The latter usage is described thus: "and falleth into the pit : לְיִפְתָּ he is or was making." Then he says in a footnote: "Not, as A.V., made; the impf. shews that the writer thought of the process as not completed--while engaged upon carrying out his design, the destruction overtakes him."<sup>2</sup> The Berkeley Version gives the same idea: "and has fallen into the hole even while making it."

G. R. Driver, refuting the theory of "emergent or nascent action," construes the verb in Isaiah 51:2 preteritively: "But the theory becomes a reductio ad absurdum as applied to the preterite use of yiqtol in poetry: for example, it is hopelessly forced to explain... 'S. (who) travailed with you' as meaning properly 'S (who) went on to travail with you.'"<sup>3</sup> Certainly a preterite use for the verb is the only use unattended with artificiality.

2. With לְ suppressed:

a) I Kings 7:8b "And a house (which) he made (ya<sup>c</sup>aseh)<sup>4</sup> for the daughter of Pharaoh (whom Solomon took) (was) as this porch"

Our rendering is not without difficulty, but we believe that it is defensible.

---

<sup>1</sup>B. Kienast ("Das Punkualthema \*yaprus und seine Modi," Orientalia, Vol. 29 (1960), p. 155.) contends that relative clauses were at one time used without the introductory pronoun, and that remnants of such employment are seen, for example, in the Accadian relative clause bīt lpušū. This speaks for an old usage of the Hebrew forms.

<sup>2</sup>S. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 31.

<sup>3</sup>G. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 87.

<sup>4</sup>The LXX unnecessarily lacks the verb.

- b) I Kings 20:27 "And the sons of Israel, (who) had been mustered (hotpāq<sup>e</sup>dū) and supplied (w<sup>e</sup>kolk<sup>e</sup>lū), they went to meet them"

This seems to be the most suitable rendering. The emphasis is probably on their going out to battle, not on their being mustered and supplied with provisions; hence the "mustering" and the "supplying" are best viewed in a subordinate position.

- c) II Kings 23:15 "And he burned the high place, (which) he crushed (hēdaq) to dust and burned (w<sup>e</sup>sārap) (its) Asherah"

This is by no means a clear example. As the verb "crushed" has no object expressed, we have referred it, as well as the verb "burned," to the Asherah. So it would read thus: "whose Asherah he crushed to dust and burned." In verse 6 both verbs refer to the Asherah, but there the word order is reversed.

3. With waw equivalent to 7<sup>u</sup> X:

- a) Genesis 6:4 "And also after this, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, who bore (w<sup>e</sup>yāl<sup>e</sup>dū) to them"<sup>1</sup>
- b) Exodus 36:38 "And its five pillars and (i.e. with) their hooks, which he plated (w<sup>e</sup>sippāh) their tops and their fillets with gold and their five bases with bronze"

As there is no verb in the last clause, it appears that the lone verb is used in both clauses. This seems

---

<sup>1</sup>The Berkeley Version reads similarly: "who bore them children."

to be better than supplying a different verb in the last clause. Also, this unites all the elements--the tops, fillets and bases; the usual renderings treat the bases separately. Although the bases were plated with a different metal, it is not necessary to consider them separately. The verse as we have it reads: "and its five pillars with their hooks, whose tops and fillets he plated with gold and five bases (he plated) with bronze."

- c) Exodus 38:28 "And of the thousand and seven hundred and five and seventy (shekels) he made hooks for the pillars, which he overlaid (w<sup>e</sup>sippāh) their tops and filleted (w<sup>e</sup>hiššaq) them"

This example is similar to Exodus 36:38 immediately above. The verse reads thus: "And of the thousand and seven hundred and five and seventy shekels he made hooks for the pillars, whose tops he overlaid and filleted."

- d) Exodus 39:3 "And they hammered out the thin plates of gold, which he (in turn) cut up (w<sup>e</sup>qissēs) into threads"

The pronoun "they" probably refers to the workers in general, viz. the "men wise of heart" (see 36:1), whereas the singular pronoun "he" refers to Bezaleel, who, along with Aholiab, was especially filled with the Holy Spirit for the work of building the tabernacle (see 35:30ff.).<sup>1</sup>

- e) Numbers 10:21 "And the Kohathites, the bearers of the sanctuary, set out, who they set up (w<sup>e</sup>hēqîmû) the dwelling in preparation for their coming"

---

<sup>1</sup>The plural לְכָל־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל (following the Samaritan Pentateuch) in the Biblia Hebraica critical apparatus is quite arbitrary.

The verse reads as follows: "And the Kohathites, the bearers of the sanctuary, set out, in preparation for whose coming they set up the dwelling."

- f) Deuteronomy 2:12 "And in Seir dwelt the Horim formerly, who the sons of Esau dispossessed them (yîrāšûm) and destroyed them (wayyašmîdûm)"

In this verse the simple Imperfect and the Imperfect with waw consecutive are equated: "whom the sons of Esau dispossessed and destroyed." They are both preterite tenses of the preformative type.

- g) Judges 20:16 "Every one of these a slinger with the stone at the hair who did not miss (yeh<sup>a</sup>ti')"

We might paraphrase the expression thus: every one of these was an expert slinger who did not miss."

- h) I Samuel 2:13,14 "And came the servant of the priest... and (i.e. with) the three-pronged fork in his hand, which he thrust (w<sup>h</sup>ikkāh) into the pot"<sup>1</sup>
- i) I Samuel 2:18,19 "And Samuel ministered before the LORD, a youth girded with a linen ephod, who a little robe his mother made (ta<sup>a</sup>śeh) for him, which she brought up (w<sup>h</sup>a'al<sup>e</sup>tāh) to him from year to year"<sup>2</sup>

The verse reads as follows: "And Samuel ministered before the LORD, a youth girded with a linen ephod, whose mother made for him a little robe, which she brought up to him from year to year."

---

<sup>1</sup>We have followed the Berkeley Version: "which he thrust into the pot."

<sup>2</sup>The Berkeley Version renders the waw (with the Perfect) as a relative pronoun: "which from year to year she brought," as does also Dr. James Moffatt: "which she brought to him year by year."

- j) Compare I Samuel 17:38 "And Saul clothed David with his (military) garments, who he put (w<sup>e</sup>nātan) a helmet of bronze upon his head and clothed (wayyalbēs) him with a coat of mail"

i.e. upon whose head he put...and whom he clothed.

- with II Samuel 12:3 "One little ewe lamb which (šer) he bought (qānāh) and nurtured it (wayḥayyehā)"

The Perfect with waw in I Samuel 17 seems to be an equivalent of the Perfect with  $\neg \psi \underline{x}$  in II Samuel 12. Thus the waw here =  $\neg \psi \underline{x}$ , and the Perfects themselves are equated. Further, they are equivalent in usage to the Imperfect with waw consecutive. The Perfect with waw therefore is in straight past time.

- k) I Kings 4:7 "And to Solomon (were) twelve officers over all Israel, who<sup>1</sup> supplied (w<sup>e</sup>kilk<sup>e</sup>lū) the king and his household"
- l) I Kings 6:32 "And two doors of oleaster-wood, which he carved (w<sup>e</sup>qāla<sup>c</sup>) upon them carvings of cherubim...and overspread (w<sup>e</sup>sippāh) with gold"

The verse reads: "And two doors of oleaster-wood, upon which he carved carvings of cherubim and over which he spread gold."

- m) I Kings 14:27 // II Chronicles 12:10 "And the king Rehoboam made in their place shields of bronze, which he committed (w<sup>e</sup>hipqāid) to the hands of the officers of the guard"

---

<sup>1</sup>A number of versions render the waw as a relative.

- n) II Kings 3:4 "And Mesha the king of Moab was a sheep-raiser, who paid (as tribute) (w<sup>e</sup>hēsîb) to the king of Israel an hundred thousand lambs"<sup>1</sup>
- o) II Kings 12:15 "For to the doers of the work they gave it, who repaired (w<sup>e</sup>hizz<sup>e</sup>qû) with it the house of the LORD"<sup>2</sup>
- p) Ezra 8:36 "And they gave the edict of the king to the satraps of the king and governors on this side of the river, who<sup>3</sup> aided (w<sup>e</sup>niśś<sup>e</sup>û) the people"
- q) I Chronicles 8:6,7 "And these (are) the sons of Ehud (these are they--the heads of the fathers of the inhabitants of Geba--whom they carried away into exile to Manahath), namely, Naaman and Ahijah and Gera, he (is) Heglam, who begot (w<sup>e</sup>hōlîd) Uzza and Ahihud"

This is a difficult passage, but we believe that the R.S.V. has in general the correct idea: "Naaman, Ahijah, and Gera, that is, Heglam, who was the father of Uzza and Ahihud." Hence, "Heglam" is viewed as a proper name rather than as a verb ("he carried them away into exile"). Perhaps Gera was named "Heglam" because he was one of the sons who were associated with the exile.

- r) I Chronicles 9:26 "They, the Levites, who were (w<sup>e</sup>hāyû) over the chambers"

---

<sup>1</sup>The R.S.V., following the Targum, unwarrantably adds the word "annually": "and he had to deliver annually." Evidently this is an attempt to bring out the repetitive idea.

<sup>2</sup>The Berkeley Version renders the waw as a relative pronoun: "who destroyed the house of the LORD," as does also the R.S.V.; but it gives the verb a progressive force: "who were repairing the house of the LORD."

<sup>3</sup>Dr. James Moffatt renders the waw as a relative: "who lent their aid to the people and to the house of God."

This is a difficult verse, but the entire verse seems to read as follows: "For in (an office of) trust (were) they, the four mighty of the gatekeepers, these Levites who were over the chambers and over the treasures of the house of God."

In the 18 examples in this section, in which most of the verb forms are Perfects with waw, the conjunction waw may quite readily be rendered as a relative pronoun. Is this the force of the waw in Hebrew, or is it merely that we have made the meaning more definite by way of accommodation to the usage of the English language? In other words, does it conform to Hebrew usage, or is it simply a requirement of the English idiom? The apparent flexibility of usage exhibited by the waw, coupled with the extensive employment in this section of the waw with the Perfect, often in a manner otherwise quite inexplicable, indicates that it is a warranted usage in Hebrew. Thus we may conclude that this versatile particle sometimes begins a relative clause,<sup>1</sup> and that in not a few cases when so used it is prefixed to the Perfect. This also indicates that it is the type of construction and not the kind of action which determines the use of the verb.

4. With  $\gamma \psi \chi$  suppressed (used partitively):

- a) Compare I Samuel 13:17,18 "And the destroyers came out from the camp of the Philistines in three companies, (of whom) one company turned (yipneh) the way of Ophrah...and another company turned (yipneh) the way of Beth-horon...and another company turned (yipneh) the way of the border"
- with II Chronicles 4:6 "And he made ten lavers,

---

<sup>1</sup>See Koehler-Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958), p. 245: "Der mit | eingeleitete Satz kommt e. Relativsatz gleich."

of which he set (wayyittēn) five on the right and five on the left"

and Exodus 18:3,4 "And her two sons, of whom (\*ašer) the name of the one (was) Gershom... and the name of the other (was) Eliezer"

In this verse 7<sup>w</sup> is expressed, but the verb is wanting.

Evidently there is a relative pronoun suppressed in I Samuel 13:17, and in II Chronicles 4:6 the underlined waw consecutive is apparently equivalent to the relative. These contentions have been deduced from the parallel expression in Exodus 18, which has been cited to show that the particle 7<sup>w</sup> can be used to begin expressions of this type. Then, too, it can hardly be denied that the simple Imperfects in I Samuel and the Imperfect with waw consecutive in II Chronicles are identified.

- b) I Kings 7:15 "And he cast the two pillars with bronze, eighteen cubits the height of the first pillar and a measuring line of twelve cubits measured the circumference (yāsōb) of the second pillar"

i.e. "And he cast the two pillars with bronze, (of which) eighteen cubits was the height of each and a measuring line of twelve cubits measured the circumference of each." So we may phrase it thus: "And he cast two pillars of bronze, each of which was eighteen cubits high and twelve cubits in circumference."

- c) I Kings 7:38 "And he made ten lavers of bronze, (of which) forty baths contained (yākīl)<sup>1</sup> the one laver (i.e. each laver)"

---

<sup>1</sup>S.R. Driver (op.cit., p.34) views the Imperfect as a frequentative: "used to or would contain." But this is very forced.



So we may phrase it thus: "And he made ten  
lavers of bronze, each of which contained forty baths."

- d) I Kings 10:16, 17 // II Chronicles 9:15,16 "And the  
king Solomon made two hundred large shields  
with beaten gold, (of which) six hundred  
(shekels) in gold went up (ya<sup>ʿal</sup>eh) upon each  
shield; and (he made) three hundred shields  
with beaten gold, (of which) three minas in  
gold went up (ya<sup>ʿal</sup>eh) upon each shield"

So we may phrase it thus: "And king Solomon made  
two hundred large shields of beaten gold, each of which  
contained six hundred shekels of gold; and he made three  
hundred shields of beaten gold, each of which contained  
three minas of gold."

It is difficult to view the verbs in these examples in  
any other way than as straight past tenses. A frequentative  
force is out of the question. A distributive sense is unlikely.  
A. B. Davidson says that the "Impf. is used...in stating the  
amount of metal that went to each of a class of articles,  
I K. 10. 16 ...."<sup>1</sup> It is obvious that the idea of distribution  
is indicated in I Kings 10:16, but in the word "each" not in the  
verb. If the word "each" distributes the verb "went up," then  
in II Chronicles 4:6 the expressions "five on the right" and  
"five on the left" distribute the verb "set." But the verb "set"  
is an Imperfect with waw consecutive not a simple Imperfect! If  
on the other hand the Imperfect with waw consecutive is the relic  
of an old preterite tense, it is most reasonable to assume that  
the simple Imperfect is also. This to us is the only plausible  
solution to the problem.

<sup>1</sup>Davidson, loc. cit.

J. With  $\text{וְ} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$  in compounds:

1. Genesis 2:19 "And all which ( $\text{וְ} \text{כֹל} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$ ) Adam gave a name ( $\text{יִקְרָא}$ ) to it...it was its name"
2. Exodus 34:34 "And he came out and spoke to the sons of Israel that which ( $\text{עַתָּה} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$ ) he was commanded ( $\text{יְצַוְוֶה}$ )"
3. Judges 9:25 "And they robbed every one ( $\text{כֹל} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$ ) who passed by ( $\text{יַאֲבֹר}$ )"
4. I Samuel 2:14 "All which ( $\text{כֹל} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$ ) the fork brought up ( $\text{יַאֲלֶה}$ ), the priest took for himself"
5. Compare I Samuel 2:22 "And Eli was very old and he heard all that ( $\text{כֹל} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$ ) his sons did ( $\text{יַאֲסֹן}$ ) to all Israel and the fact that ( $\text{וְ} \text{עַתָּה} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$ ) they lay ( $\text{יִשְׁכְּבֹן}$ )"

with I Kings 18:13 "Was it not declared to my lord that which ( $\text{עַתָּה} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$ ) I did ( $\text{אֲשִׁיֵּת}$ ) when Jezebel killed the prophets of the LORD, the fact that I hid ( $\text{וַאֲחֵבִי}$ ) some of the prophets"

There are parallel clauses: "all that his sons did" (I Samuel) is parallel to "that which I did" (I Kings); the fact that they lay" (I Samuel) is parallel to "the fact that I hid" (I Kings). Eli's sons' actions were doubtless repetitive, but not Obadiah's. Is this why there are two simple Imperfects in the former case and a simple Perfect and an Imperfect with waw consecutive in the latter case? At first glance this would seem to be the reason for the different forms. But this would be difficult to defend for the following reason: If in I Kings 18:13 the waw (with the Imperfect) means "the fact that," this waw is equivalent to  $\text{וְ} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$ ; and the Imperfect in construction with it is equivalent to the

second Imperfect in I Samuel 2:22, both in usage and in form. Now if they are equated, the idea that one denotes repetitious action and the other does not cannot be entertained. It is obvious then that aspectual distinctions do not come under consideration. Both forms are in straight past time, and in this light so are the first Imperfect in I Samuel and the Perfect in I Kings.

6. Compare I Samuel 14:47 "And wherever (ūb<sup>e</sup>kōl 'ašer) he turned (yīpneh), he inflicted punishment" with Judges 2:15 "Wherever (b<sup>e</sup>kōl 'ašer) they went out (yās<sup>e</sup>'ū), the hand of the LORD was against them"

It appears that these verbs are used identically. If the former is used iteratively, so is the latter. If one may "distribute an action over its details or particulars,"<sup>1</sup> so may the other. In fact, the distributive idea is not to be seen in the verbal form but in the expression "wherever" (7<sup>e</sup>š<sup>e</sup> 7<sup>e</sup>š<sup>e</sup>). However, the idea of distribution seems not to come under consideration at all, for the Perfect as well as the Imperfect is employed after the compound 7<sup>e</sup>š<sup>e</sup> 7<sup>e</sup>š<sup>e</sup>. A straight past signification will fit both forms.

7. I Samuel 18:5 "And (i.e. when) David went out, wherever (b<sup>e</sup>kōl 'ašer) Saul sent him (yīšlāhennū), he was successful"
8. II Kings 12:13 "And for all which (ūl<sup>e</sup>kōl 'ašer) went out (yēsē') towards the house for repairing"
9. II Kings 18:7 "Wherever (b<sup>e</sup>kōl 'ašer) he went out (yēsē'), he was successful"

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

10. Esther 2:13 "All which (kol 'ešer) she desired (tō'mar) it was given to her"

11. Esther 2:15 "And when the turn of Esther came...to go to the king, she did not require anything except that which ('et 'ešer) Hegai appointed (yō'mar)"

All the simple Imperfects in this section (if taken by themselves) could, with the exception of the form in Genesis 2:19, be construed in a frequentative sense. But when they are compared with examples such as the simple Perfect in Judges 2:15 and the simple Perfect and Imperfect with *waw* consecutive in I Kings 18:13 (which are used in similar constructions), difficulties accrue to such an explanation. A comparison of usage instead of corroborating an iterative force for the Imperfects tends rather to militate against it. The fact that all the forms are employed in constructions of like type gives us the distinct impression that the Imperfects do not denote an action different from that denoted by the Perfect but are rather component parts of a stereotyped idiom. The Perfect on the other hand, when it had gathered active meaning, absorbed the function of the earlier form and hence was incorporated into the idiomatic construction.

#### K. Forms following the casus pendens:

1. Genesis 47:22 "For a prescribed portion for the priests from Pharaoh, and they ate (w<sup>e</sup>'āke<sup>l</sup>û) their portion which Pharaoh gave to them"

The expression "a prescribed portion for the priests from Pharaoh" = "their portion which Pharaoh gave to them." Hence the verse reads: "As for a prescribed portion for the priests from Pharaoh, it they ate." The verse may be phrased thus: "For the priests had a prescribed portion from Pharaoh which they ate."

2. Exodus 18:26 "And they judged the people at all times: the matter which was hard, (it) they brought (yebî'ûn) to Moses; and every matter which was small, (it) they judged (yišpûtu) themselves"
3. Compare Exodus 33:7 "Thus it was: any one who sought the LORD, he (i.e. this one) went out (yēsē') to the tent"

with II Samuel 15:2 "Thus it was: any man who there was to him a cause to come to the king for judgment, Absalom called (wayyiqra') to him"

The simple Imperfect could well be construed iteratively, but in that case so could the Imperfect with *waw* consecutive. In fact it is so construed in the R.S.V.: "Absalom would call." It is clear, however, that both verb forms are elements of an idiomatic construction: they begin the apodosis following the casus pendens. In this light, the idea of iteration is irrelevant. Both forms are best seen as straight past tenses.

4. Exodus 40:38 "For the cloud of the LORD upon the tabernacle by day, and fire became (tihveh) at night upon it"

It is clear that the emphasis is on the cloud, for it is mentioned in verses 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38. But no mention is made of fire until verse 38. Therefore, it is unlikely that fire would be mentioned apart from its connection with the cloud. Hence we believe that the usual translation (viz. "For the cloud of the LORD was upon the

tabernacle by day, and fire was by night upon it") is incorrect. It was the cloud that was fire by night.

Thus the verse reads: "As for the cloud of the LORD upon the tabernacle by day, it fire was by night upon it." The verse may be phrased thus: "The cloud of the LORD upon the tabernacle by day was fire by night upon it."

5. Numbers 11:7,8 "And the manna as seed of coriander it and its appearance as the appearance of bdellium (the people went quickly and gathered and ground in the mills or beat in the mortar and cooked in the pot and made it into cakes), and its taste was (ḥāyāh) as the taste of a cake of oil"

Verse 8 to the Āthnāh is parenthetical. It was the taste of the manna about which the people murmured, not its nature and appearance. The manna lacked "das Scharfe und Sauere, was den menschlichen Speisen in Folge der sündlichen, unruhigen Begierde und des unablässigen Wechsels des Lebens erst den Reiz gibt." <sup>1</sup> Hence the emphasis is on the taste of the manna; therefore, in the rendering the taste is in the main clause and the nature and form are in subordinate clauses. Thus the verses read: "And as for the manna, which was as coriander seed and whose appearance was as the appearance of bdellium, its taste was as the taste of a cake of oil." The verses may be phrased

---

<sup>1</sup>C.F. Keil, Biblischer Commentar über die Bücher Mose's (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1862), p.224.

thus: "And the manna, which was as coriander seed and whose appearance was as the appearance of bdellium, tasted like a cake of oil."

6. Joshua 15:63 "And (as for) the Jebusites the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the sons of Judah were not able (yûk<sup>4</sup>elû; Kethîbh) to dispossess them"
7. Joshua 21:41,42 "All the cities of the Levites in the midst of the possession of the sons of Israel (cities forty and eight and their pasture lands), these cities were (tihyênâh) city (by) city and its pasture lands round about it"

The noun "cities" is repeated. The verses read: "As for all the cities of the Levites..., these were city by city with its pasture lands round about it." The verses may be phrased thus: "All the cities of the Levites...were forty-eight cities, each of which had its pasture lands round about it."

8. Judges 6:3 "Thus it was; when Israel sowed, then came up Midian; and (as for) Amalek and the sons of the east, they came up (w<sup>e</sup>alû) against it"

The text is difficult. In an attempt to support our rendering, we shall cite three examples which seem to be used similarly:

- a) II Samuel 15:30 "And David went up by the ascent of Olives, going up and weeping, and head to him was covered, and he went barefoot; and (as for) all the people who (were) with him, they covered (hāpû) every man his head and went up (w<sup>e</sup>alû), going up and weeping"

- b) II Samuel 19:17,18 "And Shimei made haste...and went down with the men of Judah to meet the king David, and a thousand men with him from Benjamin; and (as for) Ziba the servant of the house of Saul and his fifteen sons and his twenty servants with him, they rushed (w<sup>e</sup>sāl<sup>ehû</sup>) to the Jordan before the king"
- c) II Samuel 19:41 "And the king passed along to Gilgal, and Chimham passed along with him; and (as for) all the people of Judah, they brought over (wayya<sup>a</sup>birû; K<sup>e</sup>thîbh) the king and also half the people of Israel"

C. F. Keil says that "das Keri יִרְדּוּ יְיָ is erleichternde Lesart für das Chet. יִרְדּוּ יְיָ וְיָ and das Volk anlangend, so hatten sie...."<sup>1</sup> But it is a rule in textual criticism that the more difficult reading is likely to be the proper one. Besides, this more difficult reading is in line with the three preceding examples.

9. Judges 17:6 // Judges 21:25 "In those days there was no king in Israel; a man that which was upright in his eyes, (it) he did (ya<sup>a</sup>sah)"
10. Judges 19:30 "Thus it was: any one who saw, he (i.e. this one) said (w<sup>e</sup>'amar)"
11. I Samuel 2:14 "All that the fork brought up, (it) the priest took (yiqqah) for himself"

---

<sup>1</sup>C. F. Keil, Biblischer Commentar über die Prophetischen Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1864), p. 326.



12. Compare I Samuel 17:20 "And (i.e. when) he came to the entrenchment, then the army which went out to the battle-line, they shouted (w<sup>o</sup>hērē(û)) in the battle"
- with I Samuel 14:19 "While Saul spoke to the priest, then the tumult which (was) in the camp of the Philistines, it went (wayyēlek), going and becoming great"

It appears that the two verb forms are used in the same way. One might view the former progressively: "they were in the process of shouting," but in that case one should view the latter in the same manner: "it was in the process of going." But this latter verb is an Imperfect with waw consecutive and thus can hardly be construed in a progressive sense. The fact that it occurs in a construction like that in which the Perfect with waw is used argues for a straight past sense for both verb forms. These forms are component parts of an idiomatic construction: they begin the apodosis after the casus pendens.

13. II Samuel 12:31 "And the people who (were) in it, he brought out (hōsî) and placed (wayyāsem) in the saws...and caused them to pass away (i.e. caused them to perish; w<sup>o</sup>he'ebîr 'ôtam)"

We may render the expressions thus: "And the people who (were) in it, then he brought out and placed in the saws...and caused to pass away." The simple Perfect, Imperfect with waw consecutive and Perfect with waw appear to have identical force: "then he brought out and placed... and caused to pass away." They are straight past tenses used in construction with the personal pronoun "them," and following the casus pendens.

14. I Kings 5:8 "And (as for) the barley grains and the

straw for the horses and for the swift stallions, (then) they brought (yābi'û) to the place where he was"

15. I Kings 10:22 // II Chronicles 9:21 "For the ships of Tarshish to the king in the sea with the ships of Hiram, once at three years came (tābô') the ships of Tarshish"

The expression "ships of Tarshish" is repeated. The verse reads: "As for the ships of Tarshish..., they once every three years came." The verse may be phrased thus: "For the ships of Tarshish..., at sea with the ships of Hiram, came once every three years."

16. I Kings 10:28 // II Chronicles 1:16 "And the going out of the horses which (were) for Solomon from Egypt, and the company of the traders of the king received (yiqchû) a company (of horses) for a price"

The word  $\times\text{qin}$  "export" =  $\eta\eta\text{p}^n$  "company (of horses)." Also we believe that Gesenius had the correct idea concerning the double use of the word  $\eta\eta\text{p}^n$ : "Lusus verborum inest in duplici usu vocabuli  $\eta\eta\text{p}^n$  de mercatorum agmine deque equorum grege."<sup>1</sup> The verse reads: "And as for the export of the horses..., the company of the traders...received it for a price." The verse may be phrased thus: "And the export of the horses... the company of the traders...received for a price."

We realise that the LXX and the Vulgate, followed by a number of versions, construe the word  $\eta\eta\text{p}^n$  as a

---

<sup>1</sup>W. Gesenius, Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Lipsiae: Fr. Chr. Guil. Vogelii, 1833), p. 611.

proper name with a prepositional prefix. But we think that the additional proper noun only results in confusion, for it would mean that Egypt is mentioned first and then Kue twice and finally Egypt again (ver. 29). There is no confusion if Egypt alone is used. Although Kue may have been "eine an der Grenze Aegyptens gelegene Zollstätte,"<sup>1</sup> it seems doubtful that it would be used along with Egypt as a place whence the export came.

17. I Kings 13:33 "And Jeroboam made again from the whole of the people priests of the high places; whoever desired, he filled (yemallē') his hand"
18. Esther 2:13 "All that she desired, (this) was given (yinnātēn) to her"
19. Nehemiah 12:38,39 "And the second thanksgiving choir which went over against and I after it...from upon the wall above the tower of the furnaces to the broad wall and from upon the gate of Ephraim...to the gate of the sheep, and they stopped (we'āmedū) at the gate of the guard"

The verses read: "And as for the second thanksgiving choir which went over against...from upon the wall above the tower of the furnaces to the broad wall and from upon the gate of Ephraim...to the gate of the sheep, they stopped at the gate of the guard."

20. I Chronicles 9:23,24 "And they and their sons over the gates of the house of the LORD, namely, the

---

<sup>1</sup>Keil, Bibl. Com. u. d. Prophet. Geschichts. d. A. T., p. 123

house of the tent for guards. Towards the four winds were (yihyû) the gatekeepers"

The expression "they and their sons over the gates" = "the gatekeepers." The verses read: "And as for them and their sons, who were over the gates..., they on the four sides were."

21. I Chronicles 23:14 "And (as for) Moses the man of God, his sons were called (yiqqār<sup>e</sup>'û) after the tribe of Levi"

22. II Chronicles 29:19 "And all the vessels, which the king Ahaz in his reign in his unfaithfulness cast away, (them) we have prepared (hōkannû) and sanctified (w<sup>e</sup>hiqdāšnû)"

The personal pronoun, with a demonstrative significance, is understood. The simple Perfect and the Perfect with waw are evidently used in straight past time (although a present perfect rendering seems best in English) in construction with the personal pronoun: "them we prepared and sanctified." The forms are in the apodosi after the casus pendens.

23. II Chronicles 31:21 "And in every work which he began in the service of the house of God and in the law and in the commandment, to seek his God with all his heart, (in it) he worked (āśāh) and was successful (w<sup>e</sup>hiślîha)"

This example is similar to II Chronicles 29:19 immediately above. The Perfect with waw may be translated adverbially: "in it he worked with success."

24. II Chronicles 34:4 "And they broke down before him the

altars of the Baalim; and the images which were upwards from upon them, (them) he hewed down (giddē'a). And (as for) the Asherim and the carved images and the molten images, (them) he broke in pieces (šibbar) and ground to dust (wēhēdaq) and scattered (wayyizrōq)"

This example is similar to II Samuel 12:31.<sup>1</sup>

There is an example of this usage in the Aramaic section of Daniel (7:28): "I (i.e. as for me) Daniel, my thoughts alarmed me (yēbahalumanî) exceedingly and my complexion changed (yištannôn) upon me."

It is true that most of the examples in this section could be given a frequentative force. In all the examples, however, the verb forms are employed in the apodosis after the casus pendens. Hence it would seem that the determinative factor in verbal usage is the type of construction, quite apart from the aspectual consideration.

#### L. Forms with waw equivalent to the demonstrative:

1. Exodus 18:25,26 "And Moses chose men of ability from all Israel and he gave them heads over the people.... These judged (wēšāpetû) the people at every time"<sup>2</sup>
2. Exodus 36:28,29 "And two boards he made for the corners of the tabernacle in the two sides. These were (wēhāyû) double beneath and similarly were (yihyû) double at its top"<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Supra, p. 71.

<sup>2</sup>The "Menge-Bibel" reads similarly: "Diese hatten dem Volk zu jeder Zeit Recht zu sprechen."

<sup>3</sup>The "Menge-Bibel" reads similarly: "Diese waren unten und gleicherweise oben vollständig."

3. Numbers 9:15 "And on the day of the setting up of the tabernacle, the cloud covered the tabernacle, namely, the tent of the testimony; it (i.e. this cloud) in the evening was (yihyeh) upon the tabernacle as the appearance of fire until morning"
4. Joshua 18:21 "These were (w<sup>ch</sup>āyû) the cities belonging to the tribe of the sons of Benjamin according to their families: Jericho and Beth-hoglah"
5. II Samuel 14:26 "And when he shaved his head (and it was (w<sup>ch</sup>āyāh) at the end of every year when he shaved...), then he weighed"

The clause "when he shaved" is repeated. Hence the verse reads: "And when he shaved his head (this was at the end of every year...), then he weighed." Or the waw may be translated as a relative pronoun, as the Berkeley Version renders it: "When he cut his hair, which he would do at the end of every year."

6. I Kings 20:32,33 "And he said: Is he yet alive? My brother is he. This the men took as an omen (y<sup>en</sup>ahāgû)"

It was Ahab's utterance that the men took as an omen. The Berkeley Version has the same idea: "The men considered this an omen." The fact that this clause is bracketed by discourse ("And he said: My brother.... And they said: Your brother") points to the single instance of the "taking as an omen." Also it indicates that this was a "momentary" action. Hence the R.S.V. rendering "now the men were watching for an omen" is quite wrong.

In these examples the Perfect with waw in Exodus 18:26 and II Samuel 14:26 and the simple Imperfect in Numbers 9:15 could have an iterative force. But the others (2 Perfects with waw and 2 Imperfects) cannot take this force. In fact, an example such as Exodus 36:29 points up the opposition in undoubted clarity; for here a Perfect with waw and a simple Imperfect occur where there is absolutely no thought of progression or repetition. Nor is there any thought of duration. The same applies to the Perfect with waw in Joshua 18:21. This leaves only the Imperfect in I Kings 20:33, which we discussed above. It too can hardly support the aspect theory.

M. Forms with the demonstrative particle  $\text{הַ}$  or  $\text{הָ}$ :

1. With  $\text{הַ}$  expressed:

Genesis 37:7 "And behold (w<sup>e</sup>hinnēh) your sheaves came round (t<sup>e</sup>subbēnāh) and bowed down (wattištah<sup>e</sup>wēnā)"

S. R. Driver lists the simple Imperfect among those considered to be exceptions and then states: " $\text{הָיָאָה־לָּהֶם הַשְּׁבִיטִים}$  and behold they began to move round (Joseph represents the sheaves as being in motion; conceive  $\text{הָיָאָה}$  in place of  $\text{הָיָאָה}$  and how lifeless the image becomes!)." <sup>1</sup> Thus he renders the action conveyed by the Imperfect as nascent, which at best is an artificial rendering. Furthermore, if the sheaves "began to move round," they also "began to bow down"; for the simple Imperfect and the Imperfect with waw consecutive are in construction with the same particle ( $\text{הַ}$ ) and hence convey the action in the same manner.

Another explanation might be that of distribution:

<sup>1</sup>S. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 32.

"behold your sheaves came round one by one"; but if such be the case, they also "bowed down one by one." Hence again it is shown that there can be no distinction in usage between the two forms. It would seem that the only alternative, and the one least beset with difficulties, is to construe both forms in straight past time. Thus the verbs are identified both in usage and in form.

2. With  $\text{הָיָה}$  or  $\text{הָיָה}$  suppressed:

I Kings 8:47 "If they bring back to their mind in the land whither they were taken captive, and repent and make supplication to Thee in the land of their captors, saying: (Behold) we have sinned (hātā'nû) and acted perversely (w<sup>e</sup>he<sup>e</sup>wīnû), we have acted wickedly (rāšā'nû)"

// II Chronicles 6:37 "Behold) we have sinned (hātā'nû), we have acted perversely (he<sup>e</sup>wīnû) and have acted wickedly (w<sup>e</sup>rāšā'nû)"

Our assumption that the demonstrative particle is suppressed seems to be supported by the following example: Numbers 17:27 "And the sons of Israel said to Moses, saying: Behold (hēn) we expire (gāwā'nû), we perish ('ābadnû), all of us perish ('ābādnû)." But here of course the Perfects are used in present-future time.

3. With  $\text{לֹא}$  equivalent to  $\text{לֹא}$  ;<sup>1</sup>

a) I Samuel 21:12 "Is not (hā'lo') this David the king of the land? Did not (hā'lo') concerning this

---

<sup>1</sup>See Brown-Driver-Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), p.520.



one they sing (ya<sup>a</sup>nû) in the dances"

The verse reads: "Behold, this is David the king of the land. Behold, concerning this one they sang in the dances." In rhetorical questions of this type the negative particle  $\chi(\dot{\eta})\dot{\zeta}\dot{\eta}$  becomes a practical equivalent of the demonstrative particle  $\dot{\eta}\dot{\zeta}\dot{\eta}$ . The parallel verse (I Samuel 29:5) is worded somewhat differently: "Is not (h<sup>a</sup>lô') this David who ('ašer) they sang (ya<sup>a</sup>nû) concerning him in the dances?" Here the relative  $\neg\psi\chi$  is in construction with the verb, whereas in 21:12 the particle  $\chi(\dot{\eta})\dot{\zeta}\dot{\eta}$  is in construction with the verb form.

- b) I Chronicles 22:18 "Is not (h<sup>a</sup>lô') the LORD your God with you, and has He (not) given rest (w<sup>e</sup>hēnīha) to you"

The verse reads: "Behold, the LORD your God is with you and has given rest to you."

#### N. Forms with other demonstrative elements:

##### 1. With a repeated noun:

- a) Genesis 29:2,3 "And the stone (was) great upon the mouth of the well, whither were gathered all the flocks; and they rolled away (w<sup>e</sup>gāl<sup>a</sup>lū) the (=that) stone from upon the mouth of the well, when they watered the sheep, and put back (w<sup>e</sup>hēsībū) the (=that) stone upon the mouth of the well at its place"

The verses read: "And the stone was great upon the mouth of the well...and that stone they rolled away from the mouth of the well...and put back upon the mouth of the well." The noun "stone" is repeated. Both

verb forms are used in construction with this repeated noun.

- b) Exodus 13:21,22 "And the LORD went before them by day in a pillar of cloud...and by night in a pillar of fire.... Did not depart (yāmîš) the (=this) pillar of cloud by day and the (=this) pillar of fire by night before the people"

The verses read: "And the LORD went before them by day in a pillar of cloud...and by night in a pillar of fire.... This pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire by night did not depart before the people." The expressions "pillar of cloud" and "pillar of fire" are repeated.

- c) Deuteronomy 3:8,9 "From the valley of Arnon to Mount Hermon. The Sidonians gave the name (yigr<sup>o</sup>û) to Hermon (=this Mount) Sirion"

The verses read: "From the valley of Arnon to Mount Hermon. To this Mount the Sidonians gave the name Sirion." The proper noun "Hermon" is repeated.

- d) Deuteronomy 3:13 "All the region of Argob. To all that Bashan was given the name (yiqqārē') the land of Rephaim"

The proper noun "Bashan" = "the region of Argob."<sup>1</sup> This is equivalent to the repetition of the phrase "the region of Argob."

- e) Compare I Samuel 1:1,3 "And there was a certain

---

<sup>1</sup>See Keil, Bibl. Com. u.d. Bucher Mose's, pp. 409-410.

man...and his name (was) Elkanah.... And that  
man went up (w<sup>o</sup>ālāh) from his city from year  
 to year"

Cf. Job 1:1 "A man was in the land of Uz,  
 Job (was) his name; and that man was  
 (w<sup>o</sup>hāyāh) of integrity and upright"

and I Kings 4:7,5:7 "And to Solomon (were)  
 twelve officers over all Israel.... And those  
officers supplied (w<sup>o</sup>kilk<sup>o</sup>lū)"

with I Kings 5:27 "And the king Solomon raised a  
 levy from all Israel, and the (=that) levy  
 was (way<sup>o</sup>hī) thirty thousand men"

The Perfect with waw in I Samuel 1:3 and I Kings  
 5:7 could readily be construed in an iterative sense;  
 the Perfect with waw in Job 1:1 cannot be so construed,  
 but it could express the durative idea, when viewed with  
 its complements: "he was of integrity...he was upright."  
 In I Kings 5:27, however, the verb used in construction  
 with the demonstrative element is an Imperfect with waw  
 consecutive. It is doubtless a straight past tense.  
 Since the other forms are also in construction with a  
 demonstrative element, it seems conceivable that they  
 too are in straight past time.

In the case of I Samuel 1:3, the verb form is  
 followed not only by the demonstrative phrase but also  
 by a temporal phrase "from year to year." From the as-  
 pectual viewpoint, such a temporal phrase can hardly  
 be an influential element in verbal usage. We may cite  
 a few examples in which similar phrases occur to show  
 the validity of our contention:

- i. I Samuel 1:7 "And thus it continued  
(ya<sup>a</sup>seh) year by year"
- ii. Exodus 16:15,21 "When the sons of Israel  
saw (it), then they said one to another:  
Manna (is) it.... And they gathered  
(wayyilq<sup>et</sup>û) it morning by morning"<sup>1</sup>
- iii. II Chronicles 24:11 "Thus they did ('āsû)  
day by day"

From these examples it is difficult to see how the temporal phrase can influence verbal usage, as viewed by the aspectual theorists. Of course they would have no problem in I Samuel 1:7, for there occurs the simple Imperfect followed by the temporal phrase "year by year." But the other two examples do not concur with their theory. Of all places where one would expect a simple Imperfect, if the aspect theory be correct, these are they; but instead there occur an Imperfect with waw consecutive and a simple Perfect.

For the sake of consistency, it would seem that either all three forms denote iteration or that they are all used in straight past time. The fact that a simple Imperfect, an Imperfect with waw consecutive and a simple Perfect are used in lieu of three simple Imperfects points away from the idea of iteration and also away from the idea of aspectual distinctions. A straight past significance, without thought of aspect, for all the forms is much easier to suppose.

---

<sup>1</sup>C. Brockelmann (Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1913), Vol. II, p. 148) views some Imperfects with waw consecutive not as preterites but as frequentatives. He would doubtless place this example in the frequentative category. But a duality of usage for the consecutive form can hardly be sustained.

- f) Compare II Samuel 12:16 "And David besought God for the child, and David fasted (wayyāsom) a fast and went in (ūbā') and passed the night (w<sup>o</sup>lān) and lay (w<sup>o</sup>šākab) on the ground"

The proper noun "David" is repeated. Hence the verse reads: "And David besought God for the child, and that man fasted a fast and went in and passed the night and lay on the ground."

- with II Samuel 15:1,2 "Thus it was: after this, then Absalom prepared for himself a chariot and horses and fifty men as runners before him; and Absalom rose early (w<sup>o</sup>hiškrin) and stood (w<sup>o</sup>amad) by the side of the way of the gate"

The proper noun "Absalom" is repeated. Hence the verses read: "After this Absalom prepared for himself a chariot and horses and fifty men as runners before him, and that man rose early and stood by the side of the way of the gate."

- and II Kings 17:21 "When He had torn Israel from upon the house of David, then they made Jeroboam the son of Nebat king; and Jeroboam drove (wayyadda') Israel from after the LORD and caused them to sin (w<sup>o</sup>heh<sup>o</sup>ti'am)"

The proper noun "Jeroboam" is repeated. Hence the verse reads: "When He had torn Israel from upon the house of David, then they made Jeroboam the son of Nebat king; and that man drove Israel from after the LORD and caused them to sin."

The Perfects with waw in II Samuel 15:2 have usually been taken as frequentatives. But if we are correct

in our assumption that all the verb forms in these examples are employed in the same type of construction, then we may doubt a frequentative usage. For it is to be noted that in the other two examples an Imperfect with *waw* consecutive appears with the Perfect(s) with *waw* and in the same construction. This argues for a straight past signification for the forms.

- g) Compare II Kings 12:11,12 "And they bound together and counted the money which was found in the house of the LORD. And they gave (w<sup>e</sup>nāt<sup>e</sup>nū) the money which was measured out upon the hand of the doers of the work"

The "money which was measured out" was the money "they bound together and counted." Therefore, the verses read: "And they bound together and counted the money which was found in the house of the LORD. And that money they gave into the hand of the workmen."

with Ezra 8:24,25 and 30 "And I separated from the chiefs of the priests twelve, (and) Sherebiah, Hashabiah and with them from their brothers ten; and I weighed out to them the silver and the gold and the vessels.... And the priests and the Levites took (w<sup>e</sup>qibb<sup>e</sup>lū) the weight of the silver and the gold and the vessels to bring to Jerusalem"

The nouns "silver", "gold" and vessels" are repeated. Hence the verses read: "And I separated from the chiefs of the priests twelve...and I weighed out to them the silver and the gold and the vessels.... And this silver and gold and these vessels the priests

and the Levites took to bring to Jerusalem."

The Perfect with waw in II Kings could take a frequentative force, but not so the Perfect with waw in Ezra. Nevertheless both forms are employed in the same kind of construction; so it appears to be the type of construction, apart from any notion of the kind of action, which is the determinative element in verbal usage.

2. With a personal pronoun:

- a) Exodus 33:7 "And Moses took the tent and pitched it outside the camp, far off from the camp; and he gave the name (w<sup>o</sup>qārā') to it the tent of the assembly"

The pronoun "it" points back to the noun "tent." Hence the verse reads: "And Moses took the tent and pitched it outside the camp...and to this tent he gave the name the tent of the assembly."

- b) Numbers 11:7,8 "And the manna as seed of coriander (was) it and its appearance as the appearance of bdellium (the people whipped<sup>1</sup> (šātū) and gathered (w<sup>o</sup>lāq<sup>o</sup>tū) and ground (w<sup>o</sup>tāhanū) in the mills or beat (dākū) in the mortar and cooked (ūbišš<sup>o</sup>lū) in the pot and made (w<sup>o</sup>śā'ū) it into cakes)"

The personal pronoun "it" points back to the noun "manna"; hence we could read: "it (=that manna) the people hastily gathered and ground or beat...and cooked...and made into cakes." If the Perfects with waw are to be construed iteratively, so must the simple Perfect "beat." This in itself argues against a frequentative sense. The verb forms are probably in

<sup>1</sup>The verb šātū means "to go quickly, to whip" and here seems to be adverbial to the second verb: "hastily to gather."

straight past time in construction with the personal pronoun which has a demonstrative significance.

- c) Compare Deuteronomy 2:10,11 "The Emim formerly dwelt in it, a people great and many and tall as the Anakim; Rephaim they were accounted (yēhāšēbū) also they as the Anakim"
- and Deuteronomy 2:19,20 "For I will not give from the land of the sons of Ammon to you for a possession, because to the sons of Lot I have given it a possession. A land of Rephaim it was accounted (tēhāšēb) also it"
- with Judges 6:35 "And the messengers he sent into all Manasseh, and it was assembled (wayyiz-zā'ēq) also it after him"

In these examples the separate personal pronoun has a demonstrative force, i.e. "they" (=these Emim), "it" (=this land) and "it" (=this tribe). The simple Imperfects, as well as the Imperfect with waw consecutive, appear to be used as straight past tenses. These idiomatic constructions are probably archaisms. It is interesting to note that this idiom occurs 7 times in 5 verses in I Samuel Chapter 19 (vv. 20-24), and in each case with the Imperfect with waw consecutive.

- d) Judges 10:4 "And there were to him thirty sons...and thirty cities belonged to them; to them they have given the name (yīqrē'u) Havvoth-jair until this day"

The pronoun "them" points back to the noun "cities." Hence the verse reads: "And there were to him thirty sons...and thirty cities belonged to them; these cities they have called Havvoth-jair until this



day."

- e) II Samuel 12:3 "And to the poor man (was) one little ewe lamb which he bought and nurtured, and it grew up with him and with his sons together: it from his morsel ate (tō'kal) and from his cup drank (tišpeh) and in his bosom lay (tiškāb) and was (waittēhī) to him as a daughter"

The emphasis is on the ewe lamb, so the pronoun "it" could be disjoined from the verb for stress: "it (=that lamb) from his morsel ate, etc." The three simple Imperfects could readily be taken as frequentatives, but it is our impression that they are used exactly like the Imperfect with waw consecutive which follows: "it ate... and drank...and lay...and was." Although these clauses are explications, the explicative idea seems to be an incidental factor and hence probably does not influence verbal usage.

- f) II Samuel 23:20,21 // I Chronicles 11:22,23 "And (also) Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada.... He, he killed (hikkāh) two ariels of Moab. And he, he went down (yārad) and killed (w'hikkāh) the lion.... And he, he killed (hikkāh) the Egyptian"

The separate personal pronouns point back to the proper noun "Benaiah" and therefore have a demonstrative signification; and the verb forms are used in construction with the pronouns. The Perfect with waw, as well as the simple Perfects, is a straight past tense; and the waw prefix as a connective carries on the idea conveyed by the separate personal pronoun.

- g) Compare II Kings 3:25 "Until it (i.e. Israel) left (only) its stones in Kir-haraseth, and the slingers surrounded (wayyāsōbbū) and smote it (wayyaklūhā)"

The personal pronoun "it" points back to the noun "Kir-haraseth." Hence the verse reads: "Until it left only its stones in Kir-haraseth, and it (=that city) the slingers surrounded and smote."

- with II Chronicles 33:14 "And after this he built an outer wall to the city of David to the west of Gihon...and he carried (it) round (wəsābab) the Ophel and made it high (way-yagbīhehā)"

The personal pronoun "it" points back to the noun "wall." Hence the verse reads: "And after this he built an outer wall to the city of David...and it (=that wall) he carried round the Ophel and made high."

This comparison shows that the Perfect with waw is used in the same way as the Imperfects with waw consecutive, i.e. as a straight past tense in construction with the personal pronoun used demonstratively.

- h) Compare Nehemiah 3:13 "The gate of the valley repaired Hanun and the inhabitants of Zanoah: They, they built it (bānūhū) and set up (wayya<sup>c</sup>amidū) its doors"
- with verse 14 "And the gate of the dunghills repaired Malchijah...: he, he built it (yibnennū) and set up (wəya<sup>c</sup>amid) its doors"
- and verse 15 "And the gate of the fountain repaired Shallum...: he, he built it (yibnennū) and

covered it (wītal<sup>ē</sup>lennū) and set it up  
(w<sup>ē</sup>ya<sup>ā</sup>mīdw)"

There seems to be no difference in use between the simple Perfect and the simple Imperfects, nor between the Imperfect with *waw* consecutive and the Imperfects with weak *waw* (in non-subjunctive usage). All these verbs are in straight past time; and a separate personal pronoun, pointing back to a noun, is used in construction with the forms in each case.

- i) II Chronicles 4:6 "And he made ten lavers and set five on the right side and five on the left side, to wash in them; the materials for the burnt offering they rinsed (yādīhū) in them"

The pronoun "them" points back to the noun "lavers." Hence the verse reads: "And he made ten lavers and set five on the right side and five on the left side, to wash in them; in them (= these lavers) they rinsed the materials for the burnt offering."

- j) II Chronicles 25:14 "Thus it was: after the coming of Amaziah from smiting the Edomites, then he brought the gods of the sons of Seir, and he set them up for himself for gods; and before them (=these gods) he bowed down (yištah<sup>ē</sup>weh) and to them (=these gods) he burned sacrifices (y<sup>ē</sup>qattēr)"

The pronouns "them" point back to the noun "gods." Hence the verse reads: "After Amaziah had come from smiting the Edomites, then he brought the gods of the sons of Seir, and he set them up for himself for gods; and before these gods he bowed down and to these gods

he burned sacrifices."

# 0. Forms with 𐤊𐤍 :1

## 1. Meaning "for, because" (a causal force):

With 𐤊𐤍 expressed:

- i. Genesis 43:32 "Because (ki) the Egyptians were not allowed (yuk<sup>o</sup>lûn) to eat food with the Hebrews"
  - ii. Deuteronomy 2:30 "For (ki) the LORD your God hardened (hiqšāh) his spirit and made obstinate (w<sup>o</sup>immēs) his heart"
  - iii. Judges 2:18 "For (ki) the LORD had compassion (vin-nōhēm) from their groaning"
  - iv. Judges 6:5 "For (ki) they and their cattle came up (ya<sup>a</sup>lû) and their tents came in (yābō'û; K<sup>e</sup>thibh)"
- The expression reads: "For they with their cattle came up and their tents came in" or "For they came up and came in with their cattle and their tents."
- v. I Samuel 25:28 "Because (ki) the battles of the LORD my lord fights and evil has not been found (tinmāsē) in you from your (earliest) days"
- A future rendering for the verb, as the R.V. and the R.S.V. have it, is hardly applicable here. This is not a prediction.
- vi. II Samuel 17:17 "For (ki) they were not allowed (yuk<sup>o</sup>lû) to be seen to enter the city"

---

<sup>1</sup>This was probably originally a demonstrative or deictic particle; see Koehler-Baumgartner, op. cit., p. 431; Gesenius-Buhl, Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament (12th ed.; Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1895), p. 346; and Brown-Driver-Briggs, op. cit., p. 471.

- vii. I Kings 8:35 // II Chronicles 6:24,26 "Because (kī)  
they have sinned (yehet<sup>e</sup>'ū) against Thee"  
In I Kings 8:33  $\neg \psi \chi = ' \psi$ .
- viii. II Kings 12:15 "For (kī) to the doers of the work they  
gave it (witt<sup>e</sup>nuhū)"
- ix. Esther 9:24 "Because (kī) Haman...adversary of all the  
Jews had devised (hāsāb) against the Jews to  
destroy them and had cast (w<sup>e</sup>hippāl) Pur"
- x. Ezra 6:22 "For (kī) the LORD had made them joyful (śim-  
m<sup>e</sup>hām) and had turned (w<sup>e</sup>hēsōb) the heart of  
the king"
- xi. Ezra 9:2 "For (kī) they have taken (nās<sup>e</sup>'ū) from their  
daughters for themselves and for their sons  
and have mingled (w<sup>e</sup>hit<sup>e</sup>ār<sup>e</sup>pū), the holy seed,  
with the peoples of the lands"<sup>1</sup>
- xii. Ezra 9:13 "For (kī) Thou, our God, hast kept back  
(hāsaktā) below our iniquity and hast given  
(w<sup>e</sup>nātattāh) to us deliverance"
- xiii. I Chronicles 9:28 "For (kī) by count they brought them  
in (y<sup>e</sup>bī'ūn) and by count they brought them  
out (yōsī'ūm)"
- xiv. I Chronicles 12:23 "For (kī) day by day they came (yābō'ū)  
to David"
- xv. II Chronicles 19:3 "For (kī) you have taken away  
(bi'artā) the Asherahs from the land and have  
prepared (wah<sup>a</sup>kīnōtā) your heart"
- xvi. II Chronicles 29:6 "For (kī) our fathers have been un-  
faithful (mā<sup>e</sup>lū) and have done (w<sup>e</sup>āśū) the  
evil"

---

<sup>1</sup>The "Bible Segond" has a similar rendering: "Car ils ont pris de leurs filles pour eux et pour leurs fils, et ont mêlé la race sainte avec les peuples de ces pays."

xvii. II Chronicles 31:18 "For (kî) in their faithfulness they sanctified themselves (yitgadd<sup>e</sup>šû) in holiness"

The Imperfects in these examples, if taken by themselves, could build a good case for a possible iterative usage. The only exception seems to be the Imperfect in I Samuel 25:28. The Perfects with waw on the other hand all follow the simple Perfect, so can be explained in quite another way. Then too, the fact that all the forms are employed in ׀ clauses can lend support to our theory.

## 2. Meaning "for, because":

### a) With ׀ suppressed:

i. Genesis 31:39 "That which was torn by the wild beasts I did not bring to you; I myself bore the loss of it, (for) from my hand you required it (t<sup>e</sup>baq<sup>e</sup>šennāh)"

The conjunction "for" gives the reason for the previous statement. Without this conjunction the two clauses are disconnected.

ii. II Kings 12:17 "The money from the guilt offerings and the money from the sin offerings was not brought to the house of the LORD, (for) they were (yihyû) for the priests"

If we compare this verse with verses 14 and 15, the parallel becomes clear: "But there were not made basins... from the money...for to the doors of the work they gave it.... The money...and the money...was not brought to the house of the LORD, for they were for the priests."

### b) With waw equivalent to ׀ :

- i. Judges 12:6 "And he said Sibboleth, for<sup>1</sup> he did not give attention (yākîn) to speak thus (i.e. correctly)"
- ii. I Samuel 3:12,13 "In that day I will perform against Eli all which I have spoken concerning his house, beginning and ending. For<sup>2</sup> I have declared (wchiggadtî) to him that I will judge his house"
- iii. II Kings 8:10 "And Elisha said to him: Go, say: You shall not<sup>3</sup> living live, for the LORD has shown me (wehir'anî) that dying he shall die"

Most of the versions choose the Qerê *i'z* rather than the Kethîbh *x'z* and render the verse substantially as follows: "And Elisha said to him: Go, say to him: Living you shall live, but the LORD has shown me that dying he shall die." We believe, however, that the first rendering (according to the Kethîbh) is to be preferred. Here are C. F. Keil's pertinent remarks:

"Die meisten Ausll. haben nach dem Vorgange der alten Uebersa...für das Keri sich entschieden, weil 1) die Vermuthung, dass *i'z* in *x'z* geändert ward um Elisa keine Unwahrheit verheissen zu lassen nahe liege, 2) wegen der äusserst seltenen Stellung der Negation vor dem infin. abs. bei folgendem verbo fin. Aber beide Gründe beweisen nicht viel. Gerade die seltene Stellung des *x'z* vor dem infin. abs. bei folgendem verbo fin. konnte in Verbindung mit dem

---

<sup>1</sup>A number of versions also translate the waw as "for, because": Eng. A.V., R.V., R.S.V.; Germ. "Menge-Bibel" "weil"; Fr. "Bible Segond" "car."

<sup>2</sup>A number of versions also translate the waw as "for": Eng. A.V., R.V.; Germ. "Elberfelder Bibel" "denn"; Dutch "Nieuwe Vertaling" "want."

<sup>3</sup>The only version we have seen which renders *x'z* as a negative is the Dutch "Dordrecht Vertaling": "En Elîsa zeide tot hem: Ga, zeg: Gij zult ganschelijk niet genezen; want de HEERE heeft mij getoond, dat hij den dood sterven zal."

Fehlen des pron.  $\text{יְ$  nach  $\text{וְ$  Anlass werden, das  $\text{אֲ$  für das Pronomen zu halten; und für diese Meinung konnte man darin noch eine Bestätigung finden, dass Hasaël seinem Könige die Antwort: 'du wirst leben' überbrachte (v. 14). Für die Texteslesart  $\text{אֲ}$  non spricht schon der Umstand, dass sie die schwierigere ist, theils wegen der ungewöhnlichen Stellung der Negation theils wegen des Widerspruches mit v. 14. Aber diese Stellung des  $\text{אֲ}$  findet sich auch sonst, Gen. 3,4. Ps. 49,8 u. Am. 9,8, wo der Nachdruck auf der Negation liegt, und der Widerspruch mit v. 14 erklärt sich einfach daraus, dass Hasaël seinem Könige nicht die Wahrheit berichtet hat, weil er ihn tödten und den Thron usurpiren wollte. Wir ziehen daher die Texteslesart vor, da es nicht in dem Charakter der Propheten liegt die Unwahrheit zu sagen, und die Deutung: du wirst nicht an deiner Krankheit sterben, sondern gewaltsam ums Leben kommen, in die Worte einen Sinn legt den sie nicht haben. Denn wenn Benhadad auch an seiner Krankheit nicht starb, so ist er doch von derselben auch nicht genesen.<sup>1</sup>

### 3. Meaning "but, on the contrary" (following a negative):

#### a) With $\text{וְ}$ suppressed:

- i. Genesis 31:39 "That which was torn by wild beasts  
I did not bring to you, (on the contrary)  
I myself bore the loss of it ('əhattennāh)"
- ii. Joshua 7:12 "And the sons of Israel have not been  
able to stand before their enemies, (but)  
the back they have turned (yipnū) before  
their enemies"<sup>2</sup>

#### b) With waw equivalent to $\text{וְ}$ :

Compare Joshua 22:3 "You have not deserted your brethren these many days until this day, but you

---

<sup>1</sup>Keil, Bibl. Com. u. d. Prophet. Geschichts. d. A. T., p. 250.

<sup>2</sup>The A.V. reads similarly: "Therefore the children of Israel could not stand before their enemies, but turned their backs before their enemies." (The underlined words are in italics in the A.V.)



- have kept (uš<sup>u</sup>martem) the obligation"<sup>1</sup>
- and I Kings 3:11 "Because that you have asked this thing, and have not asked for yourself many days..., but (i.e. no! rather; Germ. nein! vielmehr) you have asked (w<sup>u</sup>šā'alā)"
- with I Kings 13:33 "After this Jeroboam did not turn from his evil way, but he made again (wayyāšob wayya'as) from the whole of the people priests"
- and II Kings 18:6 "And he held fast to the LORD; he did not turn aside from after Him, but he kept (wayyišmōr) His commandments"

Of these four examples, the Perfect with waw in Joshua 22:3 could be construed in an iterative-durative sense; but in II Kings 18:6 a similar thought is expressed by the Imperfect with waw consecutive. In fact, the same verb ( וָשַׁב ) is employed. The Perfect with waw in I Kings 3:11 cannot be construed as a frequentative. These points argue against a frequentative-durative force for the Perfect with waw in Joshua 22.

#### 4. Meaning "so that" (ecbatic use):

##### a) With ו suppressed:

- Compare Genesis 48:10 "And the eyes of Israel were heavy from old age, (so that) he was not able (yūkal) to see"
- and I Samuel 3:2 "And his eyes began to grow dim, (so that) he was not able (yūkal) to see"

---

<sup>1</sup>The LXX, followed by M. Noth in the Biblia Hebraica critical apparatus, apparently misunderstood the usage. They have gratuitously deleted the waw before the Perfect. The LXX reads: ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας ἐφύλαξάτε.

with I Samuel 4:15 "And his eyes stood, so that  
he was not able (yākōl) to see"

In the first and second examples there seems to be the suppressed particle 'ו, beginning the clause of result; in the last example the waw conjunction is evidently equivalent to 'ו. The Imperfects are used exactly like the Perfect, and a straight past signification for all forms is easier to suppose than a durative force. Then too the constructions are doubtless more than mere explications; it is a matter of cause and effect.

b) With waw equivalent to 'ו :

Judges 7:13 "And it came up to the tent and smote it so that it fell (wayyippōl) and overthrew it upwards so that the tent fell flat (w<sup>e</sup>nāpal)"<sup>1</sup>

The conjunctions waw seem to be equivalent to the particle 'ו. The same verbal root and stem (theme) are employed in the two verb forms, but a different translation is required in each; for it is obvious from the context that the tent fell in two stages.<sup>2</sup> This signifies utter defeat. There are parallel clauses: "smote it so that it fell" and "overthrew it so that the tent fell flat." Thus the idea of aspectual distinctions is precluded.

## 5. Meaning "that"(beginning noun clauses):

a) With 'ו expressed:

---

<sup>1</sup>The R.S.V. has a similar rendering: "and came to the tent, and struck it so that it fell, and turned it upside down, so that the tent lay flat."

<sup>2</sup>The clause beginning with the Perfect with waw is not "überflüssig" as contended in Gesenius-Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 340.

- i. Genesis 28:6 "And Esau saw that (kî) Isaac had blessed (bērak) Jacob and had sent (wəšillah) him to Paddan-aram"
- ii. Genesis 48:17 "And Joseph saw that (kî) his father put (yāšît) his right hand upon the head of Ephraim, and it was displeasing in his eyes; and he grasped his father's hand to remove it from upon the head of Ephraim to the head of Manasseh"

The verb cannot be used in a frequentative sense, nor can it be employed progressively. It is clear from the context that Jacob's hand was upon Ephraim's head, and that Joseph grasped his father's hand in order to remove it from the head of Ephraim. Hence his father was not in the process of placing his hand upon the head of Ephraim.

This verb may be rendered in English by the pluperfect: "When Joseph saw that his father had put his hand upon the head of Ephraim, then it was displeasing in his eyes." The usage corresponds to that of the simple Perfect and the Perfect with waw in the immediately preceding example (Gen. 28:6).

- iii. I Kings 18:10 "If they said nothing, then he caused the kingdom to take an oath and (i.e. or) the nation that (kî) it had not found you (yimsā'ekkāh)"

The conjunction ׀ begins the appositional clause.

b) With ׀ suppressed:

- i. Compare Judges 11:39,40 "And it became a custom in Israel (that) from year to year the daughters

of Israel went (tēlaknāh) to celebrate"  
 with Ruth 4:7 "And this (was the custom) formerly  
 in Israel concerning the redeeming and con-  
 cerning the exchanging to confirm any matter  
 (that) a man his sandal drew off (šālap) and  
 gave (wēnātan) to his fellow"<sup>1</sup>

If the Imperfect in Judges 11 has a frequentative force, so do the verbs in Ruth 4. But the first verb in the example in Ruth is a simple Perfect! If the frequentative idea is correct, why is there a simple Perfect instead of an Imperfect in Ruth? The "drawing off" was as much a part of the custom as the "giving," so it will not do to think of the Perfect in a subsidiary sense. It seems that the only suitable solution is to construe all the forms in straight past time, i.e. to view the customary actions as constituting a single fact.

ii. Numbers 9:16 "Thus it was continually (that) the cloud covered it (yāḥassennū) and (=as; note ver. 15) the appearance of fire by night"<sup>2</sup>

c) With waw equivalent to 'ו :

II Samuel 20:12 "And the man saw that (kī) every one of the people stopped (āmād), and he transferred Amasa from the highway to the field; and he threw a covering over him, because he saw every one who came by him that he stopped (wēāmād)"

<sup>1</sup>The Berkeley Version reads similarly: "In times past it was customary in Israel in order to validate redemptive and exchange transactions, that one dealer pulled off his sandal and gave it to the other."

<sup>2</sup>Luther translates the verse similarly: "Also geschah's immerdar, dass die Wolke sie bedeckte, und des Nachts die Gestalt des Feuers."

There are parallel expressions: (12a) "And (i.e. when) he saw that he stopped is parallel to (12b) "because he saw that he stopped." Hence it is clear that

$$\begin{matrix} \neg n y | \\ 17 \neg \end{matrix} (12b) = \neg n y \neg \neg (12a).$$

6. Meaning "when" (beginning a temporal clause):

- a) Compare Judges 12:5 "When (kî) the fugitives of Ephraim said (yô'm<sup>e</sup>ru): Let me cross over, then the men of Gilead said (wayyô'm<sup>e</sup>ru)"
- with Judges 2:18 "And when (w<sup>e</sup>kî) the LORD raised up (hēcîm) for them judges, then the LORD was (w<sup>e</sup>hāyāh) with the judge"

In Judges 12 it appears that the particle  $\neg$  with the Imperfect in the protasis is used in a way corresponding to the use of the particle waw with the Imperfect in the apodosis. Hence if the particle  $\neg$  could give the verb with which it is in construction a frequentative sense, so could the particle waw. In Judges 2 we have the situation in reverse. The supposed frequentative form is in the apodosis here. It is not  $\neg$  but the waw in this verse which is presumed to have the power to affect the verbal action. But on the face of it the Perfect with the particle  $\neg$  is used in a way corresponding to its use with the particle waw. If the particle waw has the power to change the verbal action, so does the particle  $\neg$ .

To insist upon a differentiation in the power exerted by the particles is purely arbitrary. And further, it is gratuitous to assume that a particle does indeed have the power to effect a change in the verbal action.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Supra, p. 22.

Consequently, it would seem that the Imperfects in Judges 12, and of course equally the Perfects in Judges 2, are equated in use as well as in form and thus are one and the same form. This points to a straight past usage for all the forms.

- b) I Kings 21:6 "And he spoke to her: When (kī)<sup>1</sup> I spoke ('adabbēr) to Naboth the Jezreelite, then I said (wā'ōmar) to him"

The expressions read in paraphrase: "At the time that I had conversation with Naboth, at that time I said specifically thus and so." One might construe the simple Imperfect in a progressive sense: "When I was speaking." But if such were the case, the verb in the protasis would be expressing the action in a different manner from the verb in the apodosis. This argues against construing the action as in progress. The simple Imperfect is probably to be viewed as a preterite tense corresponding to the Imperfect with waw consecutive which follows.<sup>2</sup>

7. With ׀ in compounds:

- a) ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀

1. II Kings 23:9 "Yet the priests of the high places did not come up (ya'ālū) to the altar of the LORD in Jerusalem, but (kī 'im) they ate ('ākelū) unleavened bread in the midst of their brethren"

---

<sup>1</sup>A number of versions take ׀ as "recitative." This is a plausible rendering; but a causal rendering, as in the R.S.V., is artificial in this context.

<sup>2</sup>G. R. Driver (op. cit., pp. 145-146) and F. Blake (op. cit., p. 10) take the simple Imperfect in a preterite sense.

The kind of action expressed by the verbs is identical: "they did not come up but they ate." What the priests did not do is counterbalanced by what they did; hence aspectual distinctions can hardly be considered.

- ii. Esther 2:14 "She did not go in again, except (kî 'im) the king delighted (hāpēs) in her and she were called (w<sup>e</sup>nior<sup>e</sup> 'āh) by name"

b) 7ֿ ֿ (each particle retains its independent force):

i. With 7ֿ ֿ expressed:

- a. Genesis 50:3 "For thus (kî kēn) were fulfilled (yiml<sup>e</sup> 'ū) the days of the embalming"
- b. Judges 14:10 "For thus (kî kēn) did (ya<sup>a</sup> sū) the young men"
- c. II Samuel 13:18 "For thus (kî kēn) were clothed (tillbašnā) the virgin daughters of the king"
- d. Esther 2:12 "For thus (kî kēn) were fulfilled (yiml<sup>e</sup> 'ū) the days of their purifications"

These examples could well lend support to the aspect theory. But one thing is certain: they are stereotyped constructions. Hence the alternative that the Imperfects are remnants of an old preterite tense of the preformative type cannot with propriety be set aside.

ii. With 7ֿ! (= 7ֿ ֿ):

- Genesis 34:7 "And the men became angry...because folly he had wrought in Israel by lying with the daughter of Jacob; for thus (w<sup>e</sup> kēn) was not done (yē 'āseh)"

P. Forms with 7ֿ :1

---

<sup>1</sup>This particle is probably from the same demonstrative root as ֿ. See Brown-Driver-Briggs, op. cit., p. 485.

1. With  $\text{וְכֵן}$  expressed:

- a) Compare Exodus 1:12 "And the more (w<sup>e</sup>ka'ašer) they oppressed (y<sup>e</sup>(annū)) him, the more (kēn) he multiplied (yirbeh) and the more (w<sup>e</sup>kēn) he increased (yiprōs)"
- with Hosea 11:2 "(The more) they called (qār<sup>e</sup>ū) to them, the more (kēn) they went (hāl<sup>e</sup>ku) from before them"

Seemingly the only way to distinguish the usage of the Imperfect from that of the Perfect is subjectively to consider the former as viewing the separate elements of a series and the latter as viewing the series in its totality. But it is doubtful that such an expedient is necessary. Probably the Imperfect forms are used because of their proximity to the particles  $\text{וְכֵן}$  and  $\text{וְכֵן}$ . In other words we may postulate that these particles were commonly employed with preformative verbs in past time and that therefore the entire idiom (the particle and the verb form) became stereotyped. Accordingly, the so-called Imperfect tenses are vestiges of an old preterite tense with prepositive pronominal elements. The so-called Perfect tenses are probably later forms in past time.

- b) Numbers 9:16 "Thus (kēn) it was (yihyeh) continually"
- c) I Samuel 1:7 "And thus (w<sup>e</sup>kēn) it continued (ya'ašeh) year by year"
- d) II Samuel 12:31 // I Chronicles 20:3 "And thus (w<sup>e</sup>kēn) he did (ya'ašeh) to all the cities of the sons of Ammon"
- e) I Kings 10:29 // II Chronicles 1:17 "And thus (w<sup>e</sup>kēn) to all the kings of the Hittites and to all the kings of Aram by their hand they brought out (yōsi'ū)"



## 2. With /ð suppressed:

- a) Numbers 9:18 (also vv.20 and 23) "According to the mouth of the LORD, (thus) the sons of Israel departed (vis<sup>e</sup>û); and according to the mouth of the LORD, (thus) they encamped (yah<sup>a</sup>nû)"

This use approximates to the temporal use:  
 "When the LORD commanded, (then) the sons of Israel departed."

- b) I Samuel 1:7 "And thus it continued year by year; as often as she went up into the house of the LORD, (thus, i.e. so often) she irritated her (tak<sup>i</sup>sennāh)"

- c) Compare I Kings 14:28 "As often as the king went to the house of the LORD, (so often) the guards took them up (vis<sup>sā</sup>ûm) and returned them (weh<sup>e</sup>šibûm)"

with II Chronicles 12:11 "As often as the king went to the house of the LORD, (so often) the guards came (bē<sup>u</sup>) and took them up (ûn<sup>e</sup>sā<sup>u</sup>m) and returned them (weh<sup>e</sup>šibûm)"

It appears that the Imperfect in I Kings is equivalent in use to the Perfect in II Chronicles. If the Imperfect-Perfect with waw combination is to be construed frequentatively, so is the Perfect-Perfect with waw combination. However, the fact that an Imperfect and a Perfect appear as the initial forms instead of two Imperfects points away from the idea of aspectual distinctions, and consequently away from the idea of iteration. All the forms are best viewed as straight past tenses.

- d) Compare I Kings 21:11,12 "As (ka<sup>a</sup>ser) it was written in the letters which she had sent to them, (thus) they proclaimed (qāre<sup>e</sup>û) a fast and caused Naboth to sit down (w<sup>e</sup>hōšîbû) at the head of the people"<sup>1</sup>
- with Judges 6:5 "For they and their cattle came up and their tents came in (yābō<sup>e</sup>û; K<sup>e</sup>thîbh); as (k<sup>e</sup>dē) locusts for multitude (both to them and to their camels was not a number), thus they came (wayyābō<sup>e</sup>û) into the land"

In these examples the simple Perfect and the Perfect with waw consecutive follow the suppressed particle 7<sup>o</sup> which emphasizes the agreement in answer to 7<sup>o</sup> 7<sup>o</sup>, and the Imperfect with the waw equivalent to 7<sup>o</sup> follows 7<sup>o</sup> 7<sup>o</sup> in the added idea of a simile. That is, in I Kings 21 as Jezebel had commanded in her letters, so the rulers of the city did; and in Judges 6:5 as locusts for multitude, so came into the land the Midianites, Amalekites and the children of the east. It is clear that the simple Perfect and the Perfect with waw express the action in the same way, and that both are used exactly like the Imperfect with waw consecutive in Judges 6. Furthermore, the Imperfect with waw seems to be expressing the action in the same way as the preceding simple Imperfect 7<sup>o</sup> 7<sup>o</sup> (K<sup>e</sup>thîbh) of the same root: "they came in... and they came in." So it would seem that all the verbs are in straight past time.

---

<sup>1</sup>The R.S.V. reads similarly: "As it was written in the letters which she had sent to them, they proclaimed a fast, and set Naboth on high among the people."

- e) Nehemiah 9:27 "And according to Thy abundant mercies,  
(thus) Thou didst give (tittēn) to them  
deliverers"

3. With waw equivalent to 7<sup>3</sup>:

- a) Exodus 33:11 "Thus the LORD spoke (w<sup>e</sup>dibber) to Moses  
face to face, as (ka:ag<sup>r</sup>) a man speaks to  
his companion"<sup>1</sup>

The way we have rendered the waw 7<sup>w</sup> 7<sup>x</sup> 7<sup>3</sup>...! =  
7<sup>w</sup> 7<sup>x</sup> 7<sup>3</sup>... 7<sup>3</sup>. The order is usually 7<sup>3</sup>... 7<sup>w</sup> 7<sup>x</sup> 7<sup>3</sup> rather  
than 7<sup>w</sup> 7<sup>x</sup> 7<sup>3</sup>... 7<sup>3</sup>, but there are instances in which 7<sup>3</sup>  
occurs first.<sup>2</sup>

- b) Exodus 36:27,30 "And for the extreme parts of the  
tabernacle towards the west he made six  
boards, and two boards he made for the  
corners of the tabernacle.... Thus there  
were (w<sup>e</sup>hāyū) eight boards"

"Thus" here is a quantitative particle "so  
many."<sup>3</sup> Hence we may phrase it thus: "So many were  
the boards."

- c) Judges 16:18 "Come up now (for he had declared to her  
all his heart); thus came up (w<sup>e</sup>alū) to  
her the lords of the Philistines"

Their action was in response to or in agreement  
with the request, i.e. according to the request, thus  
they did. The verb denoting the response is from the

<sup>1</sup>The R.S.V. renders the waw as "thus," but takes the verb as a  
frequentative: "Thus the LORD used to speak to Moses face to face,  
as a man speaks to his friend."

<sup>2</sup>See Koehler-Baumgartner, op. cit., p.443.

<sup>3</sup>Si ad quantitatem et copiam refertur, est tot (soviel)"  
(Gesenius, Lex. Man. Hebr. e. Chal. in V.T.L., p. 488.)

same root as that which denotes the request. The following examples may be explained similarly:

- i. II Samuel 13:18 "And he said: Send now this (woman) from by me to the outside and bolt the door after her.... Thus his servant brought her out (wayyōsē') to the outside and bolted (w<sup>o</sup>nā'al) the door after her"

According to the command, thus he did. The verbs are in construction with the waw prefixed to the Imperfect: "Thus his servant brought out and bolted." This waw is an equivalent of the particle וְ "thus." The waw prefixed to the Perfect is a connective. Both verbs are doubtless straight past tenses.

- ii. Ezekiel 37:4,7 (cf. 37:9,10) "And he said to me: Prophesy over these bones.... Thus I prophesied (w<sup>o</sup>nibbē'tî) as I was commanded"

- d) I Samuel 7:16 "And he went (w<sup>o</sup>hālak) as often as year by year and went round (w<sup>o</sup>sābab) to Bethel"

The verse reads thus: "And as often as year by year, thus (i.e. so often) he went and went round to Bethel." The second Perfect with waw may be rendered adverbially: "And as often as year by year so often he went on a circuit to Bethel."

- e) Introductory formulas וַיְהִי and וַיְהִי:

Compare II Samuel 15:2 "Thus it was (way<sup>o</sup>hî): any man who there was to him a cause to come to the king for judgment, Absalom called to him"

with II Samuel 15:5 "Thus it was (w<sup>o</sup>hāyāh):

when any man came near to bow down to him,  
then he stretched out his hand"

Apparently the initial conjunctions waw are equivalents of the particle  $\text{וְ}$ . Hence they point to or introduce what is to be described. We might phrase the constructions as follows: "this is how it was." They are not to be construed with a frequentative force: "and it used to be," nor do these constructions "introduce a clause...which is logically the subject of"  $\text{וְ}\text{וְ}\text{וְ}$ , as: "But it happened...that they would revert."<sup>2</sup>

(The idiom  $\text{וְ}\text{וְ}\text{וְ}$  is used where, according to the aspect theory,  $\text{וְ}\text{וְ}\text{וְ}$  would be expected; as a result, some have attempted to overcome the difficulty by an unwarranted alteration of the verb form.<sup>3</sup>)

- f) Nehemiah 13:30 "Thus I cleansed them (wəṭihartîm) from every stranger and appointed (wā'a'ānūdāh) offices"

Evidently the initial waw is equivalent to the particle  $\text{וְ}$ , i.e. in the manner described in 9:1ff., 13:1ff. and 13:23ff. I cleansed them; and in the manner described in 12:44 and 13:13 I appointed offices. Both verb forms are in straight past time and are used in construction with the particle waw equivalent to  $\text{וְ}$ . The Imperfect with waw consecutive is cohortative in form but has non-cohortative meaning.

<sup>1</sup>Burton, op. cit., p. 142.

<sup>2</sup>T. W. Nekarai, Biblical Hebrew (Philadelphia: Maurice Jacobs, 1951), p. 62. This is common in the A.V. and the R.V.: "and it came to pass...that."

<sup>3</sup>E.g. In Biblia Hebraica, the apparatus criticus for I Samuel 17:48 reads  $\text{וְ}\text{וְ}\text{וְ}$  for  $\text{וְ}\text{וְ}\text{וְ}$  in the text.

4. With  $\text{וְ}$  in compounds:a) With  $\text{וְ} - \text{לֹ}$  expressed:

Compare	Genesis 32:33 "Therefore ( <u>'al kēn</u> ) the sons of Israel have not eaten ( <u>yō*<sup>o</sup>lū</u> ) the sinew of the thigh-nerve...until this day ( <u>'ad hayyôm hazzeh</u> )"
and	I Samuel 5:5 "Therefore ( <u>'al kēn</u> ) the priests of Dagon have not trod ( <u>vidr<sup>o</sup>lū</u> )... upon the threshold of Dagon in Ashdod until this day ( <u>'ad hayyôm hazzeh</u> )"
with	Joshua 5:9 "And the LORD said to Joshua: To-day I have rolled away the reproach of Egypt from upon you. Therefore the name of that place one has called ( <u>wayyiqrā</u> ) Gilgal until this day ( <u>'ad hayyôm hazzeh</u> )"

It seems to be clear from these examples that the simple Imperfects are used exactly like the Imperfect with waw consecutive. Even if the waw prefixed to the Imperfect in Joshua 5 should be translated differently, the forms are still used alike: "they have not eaten until this day...they have not trod until this day...it has been called until this day." The only difference lies in the conjunctions used:  $\text{וְ} - \text{לֹ}$  is used with the Imperfect in Genesis and Samuel and waw with the Imperfect in Joshua. It can hardly be contended that the former conjunction gives the Imperfect a repetitive force and the latter does not, and conversely that the latter conjunction gives the Imperfect an aoristic sense (a present perfect in the English idiom) and the former does not. Clearly the kind of

action expressed by the verbs is the same.

b) With waw equivalent to  $\text{וְ} - \text{וְ}:$

I Samuel 1:7 "And thus it continued year by year; as often as she went up to the house of the LORD, thus she irritated her. Therefore she wept (wattibkeh) and did not eat (tō'keḏ)"

The way we have viewed the construction the waw prefixed to the first Imperfect is the equivalent of the particle  $\text{וְ} - \text{וְ}.$  It is used in construction with both verb forms. Thus the forms are used identically (probably as straight past tenses) and are one and the same form.

Some might compare this construction with an idiom in Arabic in which an Imperfect, following a Perfect, is usually considered to be an attendant circumstance, denoting incomplete action.<sup>1</sup> Hence the expression in I Samuel 1:7 would be rendered thus: "Therefore she wept, not eating." We have, however, been unable to locate any examples in Hebrew which seem to demand a usage corresponding to the Arabic idiom taken in this way. A few examples might be so construed, but we believe that they can be explained in other ways. For example, along with the form before us, we might cite the Imperfect in verse 10: "And she was in bitterness of soul; and she prayed (wattitnallēl) to the LORD and weeping wept (tibkeh).<sup>2</sup>" One might render the verse

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g.  $\text{وَلَا يَعْلَمُ أَيُّنَ هُوَ}$  (Wright, Arabic Gram. II, p.19). But see G. R. Driver (op.cit., p. 145) where  $\text{و}$  intervenes.

thus: "And she was in bitterness of soul; and she prayed to the LORD, weeping with weeping." But we think that either of the following renderings is to be preferred: "And she was in bitterness of soul; when she prayed to the LORD, then weeping she wept" or "And she was in bitterness of soul when she prayed to the LORD; therefore weeping she wept."

Q. Forms with  $\text{𐤀𐤃}$ :<sup>1</sup>

1. With  $\text{𐤀𐤃}$  expressed:

- a) II Kings 12:14-17 "But ('ak) there were not made (yē'āseh) for the house of the LORD basins of silver...from the money which was brought to the house of the LORD, for (kî) to the doers of the work they gave it.... And (wē) they did not reckon (yēhaššēbū) with the men..., for (kî) in faithfulness they wrought.... The money from the guilt offerings and the money from the sin offerings was not brought (yūbā') to the house of the LORD, (for) they were for the priests"

Verses 16 and 17 carry on the ideas of verses 14 and 15, for it is clear that the verses contain parallel thoughts: "But were not made, for.... And did not reckon, for.... Was not brought, (for)." We could think of it thus: "But were not made, for.... But did not reckon, for.... (But) was not brought, (for)."

---

and <sup>1</sup>This particle may be from the same demonstrative root as '𐤃 and 𐤃; see Brown-Driver-Briggs, op. cit., p. 36.



- b) Compare II Kings 23:9 "Yet ('ak) the priests of the high places did not come up (ya<sup>a</sup>lû) to the altar of the LORD in Jerusalem, but (kî 'im) they ate unleavened bread in the midst of their brethren"
- with Esther 2:14 "In the evening she went, and in the morning she returned to the second house of the women...; (yet) she did not go in (tābō') again, except (kî 'im) the king delighted in her"

The structure of the verses is identical: "the priests did not come up...but (  $\sim \text{II} \times \text{'} \text{ } \text{'}$  )" and "she did not go in... except (  $\sim \text{II} \times \text{'} \text{ } \text{'}$  )." Therefore to assume a suppressed particle  $\text{II} \times$  in Esther seems to be warranted.

2. With waw equivalent to  $\text{II} \times$  :

- a) Genesis 2:5,6 "And every shrub of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it sprouted; for the LORD God had not sent rain upon the earth.... But a mist went up (ya<sup>a</sup>leh) and watered (w<sup>h</sup>išgāh) all the face of the ground"

This is similar to cases in which the waw begins the apodosis after a concessive clause. So the expression could be rendered as follows: "although the LORD God had not sent rain, yet a mist went up and watered."

- b) Genesis 2:25 "And they were the two of them naked, the man and his wife; but they were not ashamed (yitbōšāsū)"

The expression could be rendered as follows: "Although they were the two of them naked, yet they were not ashamed."

- c) I Samuel 1:13 "And Hannah, she spoke in her heart;  
only her lips moved, but her voice was not  
heard (yiššāmē'a)"
- d) I Kings 1:1 "And the king was old..., and they covered  
him with garments; but he was not warm  
(yēham)"
- e) I Kings 8:8 // II Chronicles 5:9 "And the staves were  
lengthened, and the ends of the staves were  
seen (wayyērā'û) from the holy place..., but  
they were not seen (yērā'û) outside"

The verb forms are from the same verbal root and stem. Clearly there is no difference in use between the two forms. If one form can be construed frequently, so must the other: if the staves from one location were not seen repeatedly, then they were seen repeatedly from another locality. But obviously this would be forced. Both are plainly straight past tenses. Here is another clear example in which the simple Imperfect and Imperfect with waw consecutive are equated.

- f) Esther 3:2 "And all the servants of the king...bowed and  
did homage to Haman..., but Mordecai did not  
bow (yikra') and did not do homage (yištah'weh)"

#### R. Forms in temporal sentences (protases and apodoses):

First we shall cite a few examples that clearly indicate the temporal employment of the particle waw in order to establish its usage as a temporal particle:

- a) Compare Exodus 33:8 "When Moses went out (k'gē't) to  
the tent, (then) rose up all the people and  
stood, every man at the door of his tent"
- with Exodus 33:10 "When all the people saw (wērā'āh)

the pillar of cloud standing at the door  
of the tent, then rose up all the people  
and worshipped, every man at the door of  
the tent"

The structure of these verses shows that the waw  
prefixed to the Perfect in verse 10 is identical in use  
to ו prefixed to the Infinitive Construct in verse 8.

- b) Compare Numbers 9:21 "When the cloud was taken up  
(w<sup>e</sup>na<sup>a</sup>lāh), then they departed"  
with Numbers 9:22 "And when it was taken up  
(ūb<sup>e</sup>hē<sup>a</sup>lōtō), (then) they departed"

The structure of these verses shows that the waw  
prefixed to the Perfect in verse 21 is identical in use  
to ו prefixed to the Infinitive Construct in verse 22.

- c) Compare II Samuel 16:5 "When the king David came (ūbā')  
as far as Bahurim, then behold, thence a man  
came out"  
with II Samuel 16:16 "When (ka<sup>a</sup>'ser) Hushai came  
(bā')...to Absalom, then Hushai said"

The particle waw prefixed to the Perfect in verse 5  
is used like the particle ו with the same form in verse  
16. Hence  $X\frac{2}{7} \cdot 1 = X\frac{2}{7} \cdot 7\frac{2}{7} X\frac{2}{7}$ .

Although according to our analysis there are some  
130 instances in past time of a simple Imperfect or a  
Perfect with waw in the protasis or the apodosis or in  
both of temporal or allied sentences, we shall cite only  
a few of the most significant examples:

- d) Compare Numbers 10:35 "Thus it was: when the ark  
set out, then Moses said (wayyō'mer)"

with Numbers 10:36 "And when it rested, (then)  
he said (yō'mar)"

Although the introductory formula  $\text{וְ} \text{וַ}$  occurs in verse 35, it does not appear to alter that which follows. This seems to be a clear example of the equivalence of the two verb forms, for the constructions in which they occur are parallel. Therefore, since the Imperfect with waw consecutive is a preterite tense, the simple Imperfect is likewise a preterite.

- e) I Samuel 1:4 "The day when Elkanah sacrificed (wayyizbah),  
then he gave (wenātan)"

In this verse the verb in the protasis is an Imperfect with waw consecutive, but the verb in the apodosis is a Perfect with waw. It seems unlikely that the verb in the apodosis is to be taken in a frequentative sense if the verb in the protasis is to be construed as a straight past tense. But this is just how the aspectual theorists would have to construe it, which in itself is an argument against their theory. Surely if Elkanah "gave" repeatedly he also "sacrificed" repeatedly, for the "giving" was at the time of the "sacrificing." It is gratuitous to assume a distinction in the usage of the forms. Now if the forms are used in the same way and the Imperfect with waw consecutive is a preterite tense, then it follows that the Perfect with waw is also a preterite tense.

- f) I Samuel 5:7 "When the men of Ashdod saw (wayyir'u) that  
(it was) so, then they said (wē'āmerū): The  
ark of the God of Israel shall not abide  
with us"

The Perfect with waw cannot be construed in a frequentative sense, for the context shows that this is a single occurrence. With imagination it could be construed progressively. Rudolph Kittel (in the Biblia Hebraica critical apparatus) sees the difficulty confronting the aspect theory and gratuitously alters the Perfect with waw into an Imperfect with waw consecutive. He does the reverse in the critical apparatus for I Samuel 17:35.

- g) I Samuel 14:52 "When Saul saw (w<sup>o</sup>ra'āh) any mighty man..., then he took him (wayya'as<sup>o</sup>pēhū) to himself"

It has been suggested that the constructions could be construed thus: "Whenever Saul saw" (repetitive idea) the fact was that "he took" (a simple statement of fact). This would be valid only if one has the right to submit verbal usage to subjective judgment. Also the inherent connection between the protasis and the apodosis would be broken by the interjection of an aspectual differentiation.

- h) I Samuel 18:5 "When David went out (wayyēsē'), wherever Saul sent him, (then) he was successful (yaskīl)"

The verse is probably to be translated as we have it and not as some versions, such as the R.S.V., render it: "And David went out and was successful wherever Saul sent him." When David went out, then he was successful. If the success was repetitive, so was the going out. But the presence of the Imperfect with waw consecutive argues

against a frequentative force: rather it indicates that the aggregate is to be viewed as a mere statement of fact.

- i) Compare II Kings 12:11 "When they saw that much was the money in the chest, then the scribe came up (wayya'al)"
- with // II Chronicles 24:11 "When they saw that much was the money, then the scribe came (ûbā')"

The construction in II Kings parallels almost verbatim the construction in II Chronicles. It is true that from the aspectual theorists' viewpoint one could cite the verb in II Chronicles in an attempt to support the aspect theory. But how would one treat the verb in the parallel passage in II Kings? To avoid one's becoming enmeshed in superficial distinctions, only a straight past signification for both forms will suffice.

- j) Compare Nehemiah 9:27 "And in the time of their adversity (when) they cried out (ya'āqû) to Thee, then Thou didst hear (tišmā')"
- with Nehemiah 9:28 "When they cried out again to Thee (wayyāšûbû wayyiz'āqûkâ), then Thou didst hear (tišmā')"

Apparently in verse 27 a temporal particle is suppressed after the time-determination "in the time," i.e. "in the time (when)," as the A.V. and R.V. render it. The waw (with the Imperfect "they cried out") in verse 28 is equivalent to a temporal particle and means

"when."<sup>1</sup> So both constructions are to be rendered temporally: "when they cried out." Thus the Imperfect with the temporal particle understood and the Imperfect with waw consecutive are both straight past tenses, and are in fact one and the same form. In this light, the Imperfects in the apodoses are also to be construed as preterites; for there is a correlation: "when they cried out, then God heard."

#### S. Forms with $\tau\chi$ :

##### 1. With $\tau\chi$ expressed:

- a) Joshua 10:13 "And the sun stood still, and the moon stopped until ('ad) a nation had avenged (yiqqōm) its enemies"
- b) II Chronicles 29:34 "And their brethren, the Levites, aided them until the being completed of the work and until (w<sup>o</sup>'ad) the priests had sanctified themselves (yitqaddēšū)"

##### 2. With $\tau\chi$ suppressed:

Exodus 8:20 "And there came a heavy mixture (of flies) into the house of Pharaoh and the house of his servants and into all the country of Egypt, (until) the land was destroyed

---

<sup>1</sup>The verbal constructions in verse 28 read literally: "when they returned and cried out." So it is actually the first waw which is equivalent to a temporal particle. But the first verb is adverbial to the second, so to all intents and purposes the second waw is rendered as a temporal particle.

(tiššāhēt) from before the mixture"<sup>1</sup>

Here the Imperfect could not take a frequentative force. It might conceivably be regarded as denoting progression, as the Berkeley Version views it: "the land was being ruined by the gadflies." But it seems best to view it as an archaism in a stereotyped idiom.

3. With waw equivalent to  $\gamma\lambda$  :

- a) II Samuel 17:17 "And Jonathan and Ahimaaz stood (i.e. remained) by En-rogel until the maid-servant came (wəhālēkāh) and told (wəhiggīdāh) them"

As far as we can ascertain nothing in the context gives a hint that the maid-servant came repeatedly and told them Hushai's message. In fact it would seem to be quite the contrary. Jonathan and Ahimaaz were sent on a specific mission, and there is recorded here a specific incident relating to that mission. They remained by the well only until they had received the particular message desired; then forthwith they went and told David.

- b) II Kings 3:24,25 Literally: "And it (i.e. Israel) went into it (i.e. the land of Moab), and smiting Moab. And the cities they beat down, and (as for) every good piece of land, they threw (upon it) every man his stone and filled it; and every fountain of water they stopped and every good tree they felled until it (i.e. Israel) had left (only) its stones in Kir-hareseth"

---

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Moffatt renders the expression similarly: "till the whole land was ruined with gnats." Some versions break the thought after the <sup>2</sup>Athnāh: "there came flies into the house, and in all the land of Egypt the land was ruined." But this seems to be unnatural.



i.e. and Israel went into the land,  
 smiting Moab until they had beaten down  
 (yaharōsû) the cities, and (until) every man  
 had thrown (yašlîkû) his stone upon every good  
 piece of land and had filled it (ûmil<sup>e</sup>ûhā),  
 and (until) they had stopped (yistōmû) every  
 fountain of water and had felled (yappîlû) every  
 good tree; until (ad) Israel had left (hiš'îr)  
 only its stones in Kir-hareseth"

The text is quite difficult, but apparently the initial waw in verse 25 is equivalent to the particle  $\gamma y$ . The other conjunctions waw, as connectives, carry on the idea conveyed by the first waw. Thus the initial waw is used in construction with the Imperfects and the Perfect with waw which follow.

That the first waw may be an equivalent of the particle  $\gamma y$  is deduced from the following consideration:

The particle  $\gamma y$  is expressed at the conclusion of the list: "Israel smote...until it had left." Hence all that intervenes would seem to be used in the same way, i.e. Israel smote until all the things mentioned here (and in verse 19) had been accomplished. In other words, Israel smote the Moabites in their own land

- i. until they had beaten down
- ii. until every man had thrown
- iii. until every man had filled
- iv. until they had stopped
- v. until they had felled
- vi. until Israel (i.e. they) had left.

This shows that the Imperfects, Perfect with waw and simple Perfect are used identically. In this light, aspectual distinctions do not come under consideration.

T. Forms with  $\text{ז} \times$  :<sup>1</sup>

Compare	Numbers 35:20	"And if ( <u>wə'im</u> ) in hatred he pushed him ( <u>yehdāpennū</u> ) or threw ( <u>hišlîk</u> )"
with	Numbers 35:22	"And if ( <u>wə'im</u> ) in suddenness, without enmity, he pushed him ( <u>hādāpō</u> ) or threw ( <u>hišlîk</u> )"

The Imperfect is parallel with the Perfects, and this parallelism shows that all the forms are straight past tenses. These verb forms are in construction with the conditional particle  $\text{ז} \times$ .

U. Forms with  $\text{ז} \times \text{ז}$  :

II Kings 20:14 // Isaiah 39:3 "And he said to him: What did these men say, and whence (ūmē'ayin) did they come (yābō'u) to you? And Hezekiah said: From a distant land they came (bā'u)"

The Perfect (from the same root as the Imperfect) in the latter part of the verse makes it quite conclusive that the Imperfect preceding it is also used in straight past time.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>This seems to be basically a demonstrative particle. See Koehler-Baumgartner, op. cit., pp. 57-58.

<sup>2</sup>G.R. Driver, (op. cit., p.142) cites the Imperfect in this example as a possible survival of an archaic preterite tense.

## PART IV

### THE SIMPLE PERFECT IN FUTURE TIME

The study of this form will not be nearly as comprehensive as the study of the forms in past time (nor will it include a statistical survey); for, from all appearances, the principles employed in Part III can be applied here. A number of examples should be sufficient to show that particles play a role in verbal usage in future time just as they do in past time:

Examples of usage:

#### A. Forms with ׀׀׀ :

1. Genesis 17:20 "And concerning Ishmael I have heard you; behold (hinnēh), I will bless (bōraktî) him and make him fruitful (w<sup>e</sup>hiprētî) and multiply (w<sup>e</sup>hirbētî) him"

Ishmael's birth is recorded in Chapter 16 verse 15; but there is no previous mention of a blessing for him, only the promise to Isaac (17:19).

The pronominal object *is'x* follows each verb; also, the particle ׀׀׀ is used in construction with each form: "behold I will bless...make fruitful...multiply." Ergo the *waw* prefix with the second and third Perfect forms is a connective.

To construe the first Perfect in past time would destroy the grammatical connection. Further, the simple Perfect can hardly be construed as a Perfect of certainty unless one is also prepared to construe the Perfects with *waw* in the same way. It seems best to regard all the forms as straight future tenses.

2. Numbers 32:23 "And if you will not do so, behold (hinnēh), you will sin (hātā'tem) against the LORD"

3. Judges 1:2 "And the LORD said: Judah shall go up; behold (hinnēh), I will give (nātattî) the land into his hand"<sup>1</sup>

4. Compare II Chronicles 2:7,9 "And send to me trees of cedar..., for I, I know that your servants know to cut trees of Lebanon; and, behold, my servants (shall be) with your servants.... And, behold (w<sup>e</sup>hinnēh) to the wood-cutters...I will give (nātattî) beaten out grains of wheat"

with // I Kings 5:20 "And now command that they cut for me cedars from Lebanon; and my servants shall be with your servants, and the wage of your servants I will give ('ettēn) to you"

Although the clauses are not strict parallels, it is probable that the Perfect and the Imperfect forms are used in the same way, i.e. as aoristic future tenses. Surely there is no need to bring in the ideas of completion and incompleteness.

B. Forms with the Imperative  $\text{ןִןִן}$  used as an equivalent of  $\text{ןִןִן}$ :<sup>2</sup>

Compare Joshua 6:1,2 "And Jericho was closed and shut up from before the sons of Israel.... And the LORD said to Joshua: See (i.e. behold; r<sup>e</sup>'ēh) I will give (nātattî) into your hand Jericho and its king"

and Joshua 8:1 "And the LORD said to Joshua: Do not fear and do not be dismayed..., and arise,

---

<sup>1</sup>We cannot agree with E. Rönig (Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897), 2d Half, Part II, p. 47) who states that "  $\text{ןִןִן}$  mit Qatalformen malt nur die Lebhaftigkeit der Aussage."

<sup>2</sup>Brown-Driver-Briggs, op.cit., p. 907; Koehler-Baumgartner, op. cit., p. 862.

go up to Ai; see (i.e. behold; re'ēh) I will give (nātattī) into your hand the king of Ai"

with

Joshua 8:7 "And you, you shall arise from the ambush and take possession of the city, for the LORD your God will give it (ūn<sup>e</sup>tānāh) into your hand"

and

Joshua 8:18 "And the LORD said to Joshua: Stretch out the light spear which (is) in your hand towards Ai, for into your hand I will give it ('ett<sup>e</sup>nennāh)"

According to our thesis, if the Perfect with the particle *waw* can be employed in straight future time, so can the Perfect with other particles. It is difficult to see how there can be any aspectual distinction between the simple Perfect and the Perfect with *waw* as exhibited in these passages. Furthermore, if the Perfect with *waw* expresses the action in the same way as the Imperfect, so does the simple Perfect. Logic and common sense seem to demand a straight future signification for all three forms.

C. Forms with the compound  $\chi' \lceil \rceil$  used as an equivalent of  $\lceil \rceil \lceil \rceil$  :1

1. Judges 4:14 "And Deborah said to Barak: Arise, for this (is) the day when the LORD will give Sisera into your hand. Shall not (hēlō') the LORD go out (yāsā') before you"

In this verse  $\chi' \lceil \rceil$  is used like a particle of affirmation, so we may render the expression thus: "Behold the LORD shall go out before you."

---

<sup>1</sup> Brown-Driver-Briggs, op.cit., p. 520.

2. Judges 6:14 "And the LORD turned towards him and said:  
Go in this your strength and deliver Israel  
from the hand of Midian; do not (i.e. behold;  
h<sup>a</sup>lō') I send you (s<sup>c</sup>lahtîkā)"

The Imperative יֵלֵךְ "go" and the Perfect אֶשְׁלַחְךָ  
"I send" are in the same time area, i.e. in future  
time. The English designation would be the "immediate"  
future: "Go forthwith...behold I send you forthwith."

#### D. Forms with ׀ :

##### 1. With ׀ meaning "that":

- a) Compare Genesis 21:7 "And she said: Who would  
have said to Abraham (that) Sarah would  
give children suck (hênîqāh), that (kî) I  
should bear (yāladtî) a son"

with Job 3:12 "And why the breasts that (kî) I  
should suck ('înāq)"

It can hardly be doubted that these examples  
equate in usage the Perfect and the Imperfect. Also  
it is obvious from the parallel construction in Job  
that the particle ׀, although suppressed before  
the first underlined verb in Genesis 21:7, is a  
necessary element in the idiom. This is further  
corroborated by the fact that ׀ before the second  
underlined verb in the same verse begins the second  
object clause: "Who would have said...that Sarah  
would give...that I should bear." Hence the initial  
object clause must also begin with ׀.

The rendering "for" instead of "that" for the  
expressed ׀, followed by the past tense of the verb  
("for I have borne"), is abrupt and out of keeping  
with the context.

- b) Joshua 2:9,10 "And she said to the men: I know that (kî)  
 the LORD will give (nātan) to you the land,  
 and that (w<sup>e</sup>kî) your terror will fall  
 (nāp<sup>e</sup>lāh) upon us, and that (w<sup>e</sup>kî) all the  
 dwellers of the land will melt away (nāmōgû)  
 from before you"

Terror had already fallen upon the people of Jericho, and their hearts were melting away (ver.11) because they had heard of the LORD's victories for Israel; but this terror and fear of heart will become even more evident when Joshua crosses the Jordan and Jericho is besieged. The present fear was merely a precursor of that which was to follow. The first underlined Perfect (757) can readily be construed in future time, for the land had not actually been given into the hand of the Israelites. And, due to the type of construction, the Perfects which follow can also be given a future signification: "that the LORD will give...and that your terror will fall...and that all the dwellers...will melt away."

- c) Joshua 2:23,24 "And the two men returned.... And they said to Joshua that (kî) the LORD will give (nātan) into our hand all the land"

The particle <sup>7</sup> begins the direct discourse and is thus used like the Greek *or recitativum*. It may be represented in English either by a colon or by inverted commas (quotation marks).

Some versions (as the A. V. and the R.S.V.) render <sup>7</sup> with an intensive force "truly," which is quite proper.

- d) Compare I Samuel 17:26 "For who (is) this uncircum-  
cised Philistine that (kī<sup>1</sup>) he should reproach  
(hērēp) the ranks of the Living God"
- and II Samuel 21:5,6 "And they said to the king:  
The man who consumed us, and who thought  
against us, (that) we should be destroyed  
(nišmadnū)<sup>1</sup>..., let there be given to us seven  
men from his sons"
- with Judges 9:28 "And Gael the son of Ebed said:  
Who (is) Abimelech, and who (is) Shechem,  
that (kī<sup>1</sup>) we should serve him (na'abedennū)"

The sentence structure in these verses parallels that of the verses in a above, and again the Perfect and the Imperfect are equated in use. An aoristic future significance would suit all the forms.

2. With 'D meaning "for":

- a) Numbers 21:33,34 "And they turned and went up by the way of Bashan, and Og the king of Bashan went out to meet them.... And the LORD said to Moses: Do not fear him, for (kî) into your hand I will give (nātatti) him...; and you shall do (wəʿāsītā) to him as you did to Sihon the king of the Amorites"

The Perfect with new following shows that the simple Perfect is best taken in a future sense: "for I will give...and you shall do."

- b) Joshua 10:8 "And the LORD said to Joshua: Do not fear  
from them, for (kî) into your hand I will

The reading יִיְהוָה (cf. LXX ἐξολοθρευέτω ἡμᾶς) in the Biblia Hebraica critical apparatus is both unnecessary and unwarranted.



give them (n<sup>e</sup>tattān); a man from them shall  
not stand (ya<sup>e</sup>mōd) in the face of you"

Here the Imperfect following indicates that the  
Perfect is to be construed in a future sense.

- c) Compare Joshua 10:19 "And you, do not stand still,  
pursue after your enemies...; for (kī) the  
LORD your God will give them (n<sup>e</sup>tānām) into  
your hand"
- with Joshua 8:7 "And you, you shall arise from  
the ambush and take possession of the city;  
for the LORD your God will give it (ūn<sup>e</sup>tānāh)  
into your hand"
- and Joshua 8:18 "And the LORD said to Joshua:  
Stretch out the light spear which (is) in  
your hand towards Ai, for (kī) into your  
hand I will give it ('ett<sup>e</sup>nennāh)"

Although we compared Joshua 8:7 and 8:18 with some  
previous examples,<sup>1</sup> it would be well to compare them with  
Joshua 10:19 here. In these examples there are a simple  
Perfect, a Perfect with waw and a simple Imperfect, and  
all evidently used in the same way. If the simple Per-  
fect is a Perfect of certainty, so is the Perfect with  
waw. The only difference lies in the particles in  
construction with the forms: in the former the particle  
ו is expressed; in the latter the particle waw is  
prefixed to the verb form. But if the particle waw is  
an equivalent of the particle ו, as we have rendered  
it, then וו is equivalent to וו ו. Hence  
the forms are equated in use and so are best regarded

---

<sup>1</sup>Supra, p. 123.

as straight or aoristic future tenses. And further, since the so-called Imperfect is employed in the same manner, it is in complete harmony with this aoristic future concept.

- d) Judges 7:9 "Thus it was: in that night, then the LORD said to them: Arise, go down to the camp; for (kî) I will give it (netattîw) into your hand"
- e) Judges 7:15 "And he returned to the camp of Israel, and said: Arise, for (kî) the LORD will give (nātan) into your hand the host of Midian"
- f) I Samuel 14:10 "And if thus they say: Come up to us, then we will go up; for (kî) the LORD will give them (netānēm) into our hand"<sup>1</sup>
- g) I Samuel 14:12 "And the men of the garrison answered Jonathan...and said: Come up to us that we may make you know a thing. And Jonathan said to the bearer of his armour: Come up after me, for (kî) the LORD will give them (netānēm) into the hand of Israel"

In these examples the particle ׀ appears in construction with the Perfect of the verb ׀ used in future time. It is clear that the particle and the verb constitute an idiom. The Perfect in these stereotyped idioms is probably to be viewed as an archaism harking back to the time when the old gatil (gatal) form was employed in a future situation. It is retained simply because of its connection with the particle ׀.

- h) Genesis 30:13 "And Leah said: In my happiness, for (kî) daughters will call me happy (\*iṣṣerūnî)"

---

<sup>1</sup>Blake (op. cit., p. 18) gives the Perfect a future perfect force. But this is highly artificial, and seems to be an attempt to meet the exigencies of his theory.

The word  $\text{בנות}$  "daughters" probably refers to women in general. Gesenius renders the phrase "in (with) my happiness" adverbially, i.e. "happily" (cum felicitate mea i.e. feliciter).<sup>1</sup> So the verse would be translated thus: "And Leah said happily: Daughters will call me happy." (The particle  $\text{וְ}$  begins the direct discourse and is represented in English by the colon.) But in this case the phrase "with happiness" ( $\text{וְשִׂמְחָתִי}$ ) or "with her happiness" ( $\text{וְשִׂמְחַתָּהּ}$ ) rather than "with my happiness" ( $\text{וְשִׂמְחָתִי}$ ) would be expected. This argues against Gesenius' view. So  $\text{וְ}$  is to be rendered "for." The Perfect in construction with it can hardly be taken in any other sense than as a straight future.<sup>2</sup>

- i) Compare Deuteronomy 15:6 "For (כי) the LORD your God shall bless you (bērak<sup>a</sup>ka), as He spoke to you, and you shall cause many nations to give pledges (w<sup>e</sup>ha'abattā)"
- with Deuteronomy 15:4 "Howbeit there shall not be among you poor, for (כי) blessing the LORD shall bless you (y<sup>e</sup>bārek<sup>a</sup>ka) in the land"

A future significance for the Perfect seems to be demanded by the Perfect with waw which follows. Then too verse 4 confirms this, for there a simple Imperfect is used in a similar construction. Furthermore, if the Imperfect and the Perfect with waw are in straight future time, the simple Perfect would seem to be also.

### 3. With waw equivalent to $\text{וְ}$ meaning "for":

Genesis 17:15,16 "And God said to Abraham: (As for) Sarai

---

<sup>1</sup>Gesenius, Lex. Man. Hebr. e. Chal. in V. T. L., p. 121.

<sup>2</sup>The proposal to alter the Perfect into an Imperfect (as indicated in the Biblia Hebraica critical apparatus) is an unwarranted expedient of the aspect theory.

your wife, you shall not call her name Sarai,  
but Sarah (shall be) her name. For I will bless  
(ûberaktî) her and also I will give (nātattî)  
from her to you a son. Yes, I will bless her  
(ûberaktîhē) and she shall be for nations; kings  
of peoples from her shall be"

The simple Perfect is bracketed by Perfects with waw and thus expresses the action in the same manner as they. Apparently the initial waw in verse 16 is an equivalent of the particle <sup>7</sup>ו. It is used in construction with the Perfect to which it is prefixed and the simple Perfect which follows: "For I will bless...give."

The causal conjunction "for" (waw = <sup>7</sup>ו) gives the reason for the change of name: "Sarah shall be her name, for I will bless her and give from her to you a son."

#### E. Forms with <sup>7</sup>ו<sub>א</sub>:

##### 1. With <sup>7</sup>ו<sub>א</sub> meaning "which":

- a) Compare      Genesis 9:17 "And God said to Noah: This is the  
sign of the covenant which (šāger) I will establish  
(hāqimōtî) between Me and between all flesh"  
with              Genesis 9:11 "And I will establish (wahāqimōtî)  
My covenant with you"

It is apparent that the Perfect following the relative particle in verse 17 is in the same time area as the Perfect with waw in verse 11. There is nothing in the context to indicate that the Perfect in verse 17 is to be given a past

---

<sup>1</sup>The "Menge-Bibel" also renders the waw as "for (denn)": "sondern Sara...soll ihr Name sein. Denn ich will sie segnen und dir auch von ihr einen Sohn geben."

signification. We posit that a Perfect with the particle  $\text{וְשֶׁ}\text{X}$  can be a straight future tense as well as a Perfect with the particle waw.

- b) I Samuel 1:28 "And also I, I have given him on request to the LORD; all the days which (\*ašer) he shall be (i.e. exist, be in existence = live; hāyāh) he shall be a requested one to the LORD"

It is simpler to view the Perfect as a straight future than as a future perfect "all the days which he shall have been," as rendered in the Brown-Driver-Briggs Lexicon.<sup>1</sup>

2. With  $\text{וְשֶׁ}\text{X}$  meaning "where" (relative adverb):

- a) Judges 4:14 "And Deborah said to Barak: Arise, for this (is) the day when (\*ašer) the LORD will give (nātan) Sisera into your hand"
- b) II Samuel 17:12 "And we will come (ûbā'nû) upon him in one of the places where (\*ašer...šām) he shall be found (nimsā'), and we will settle down (w<sup>c</sup>nahnu) upon him"

Here the relative is combined with the particle  $\text{וְשֶׁ}\text{X}$ ; and the Perfect in construction with this combination is in straight (aoristic) future time, as indicated by the surrounding Perfects with waw.

3. With  $\text{וְשֶׁ}\text{X}$   $\text{לְךָ}$ :

Joshua 1:16 "And they answered, saying: All which (kōl \*ašer) you command us (siwwitānû) we will do, and to all which (kōl \*ašer) you send us (tišlāhēnû) we will go"

---

<sup>1</sup>Brown-Driver-Briggs, op. cit., p. 226.

It is possible that the first expression is to be taken in a past sense (i.e. "All which you commanded"), as Joshua had issued specific commands (ver. 12ff.); but the expression could well be more general (as in verse 18: "in regard to all which you command him," where an Imperfect is used). Also, it should be noted that the compound  $\neg\psi\chi \text{ } \text{ז}^{\text{ז}}$  in the first member of verse 16 is parallel to the compound  $\neg\psi\chi \text{ } \text{ז}^{\text{ז}}$  in the second member of the same verse. The term "whatever" has as general a connotation as the correspondent term "whithersoever."<sup>1</sup> Hence it would seem that a future significance is to be preferred.

F. Form with  $\text{ז}^{\text{ז}}$  (understood):

II Chronicles 20:37 "And Eliezer prophesied...against Jehoshaphat, saying: As you have made an alliance with Ahaziah, (so) the LORD will break down (pāras) your works"

"As you have done, so the LORD will do (  $\text{ז}^{\text{ז}}$  ...  $\text{ז}^{\text{ז}}$  "as...so"). It is a visitation of the LORD commensurate with Jehoshaphat's sin. Although Eliezer prophesied, there is no need to construe the verb as a "prophetic" Perfect. The verb could be in future time simply because of the type of construction in which it is used.<sup>2</sup>

G. Forms with the compound  $\neg\psi\chi \text{ } \text{ז}^{\text{ז}}$ :

1. Genesis 32:27 "And he said: I will not let You go, except (kī 'im) You bless me (bēraktānī)"

2. Genesis 40:14 "But (kī 'im) remember me (zēkartānī) with you,

<sup>1</sup>Supra, p. 65 for a discussion on the idea of "distribution."

<sup>2</sup>The construction is not found in the parallel section (I Kings 22:49, 50).

when it is well for you, and do I pray  
(wē'āsītā nā'), with me kindness"

Here the Perfect has a precative force,<sup>1</sup> as does the Perfect with waw which follows: "But remember...and do." The enclitic particle X̣ emphasizes the precative idea. An example or two in the Psalms may be adduced in support of the precative use of the Perfect:

- a) Psalm 4:2 "When I call answer me ('anēnī), O God of my righteousness. In the distress make wide (hirhābtā) for me. Be gracious to me (honnēnī), and hear (ūšema') my prayer"

There is a parallelism: "When I call answer me (Impv.). When I am distressed make wide (Perf.) for me."

- b) Psalm 22:22 "Deliver me (hōšī'ēnī) from the mouth of the lion, and from the horns of the wild oxen answer me ('anītānī)"

The order is chiastic. There is a parallelism: "Deliver me (Impv.) from the mouth of the lion, and answer me (Perf.) from the horns of the wild oxen."

If the Perfect and the Perfect with waw are identical, not only in form but also in use, then the precative use of the simple Perfect is to be expected; for the Perfect with waw has this use.<sup>2</sup> This usage corresponds to the Greek aorist optative and the aorist imperative in entreaties and petitions.

---

<sup>1</sup>For the optative usage of the Perfect in Arabic see Wright, Arabic Gram., II, p. 3. Ginsberg (loc. cit.) contends that "one of the original functions of the perfect was that of an optative and precative." A futurum exactum (as contended by G. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 149) is an awkward rendering.

<sup>2</sup>S. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 142.

3. Leviticus 22:6 "A person who touches it, he shall be unclean until the evening; and he shall not eat from the holy things, except (kî 'im) he wash (rāhas) his flesh"
4. Judges 15:7 "And Samson said to them; Though you have done as this, surely (kî 'im) I will be avenged (nīqqamti)"

The oath is understood. We maintain that the verb is not a Perfect of certitude. It is the particle  $\neg \times$  'ḏ "surely, certainly" which denotes certainty, not the verb in construction with it.

5. I Samuel 25:34 "And on the other hand (as) the LORD God of Israel lives..., unless you had made haste and come..., surely not (kî 'im) would be left (nōtar) to Nabal until the light of the morning a male child"

Here each particle retains its independent force: 'ḏ "surely" and  $\neg \times$  "not." ("After an oath...  $\neg \times$  ...becomes an emph. negative.")<sup>1</sup>

6. II Samuel 5:6 "And went the king and his men to Jerusalem to the Jebusite, the dweller of the land, and he said to David, saying: You shall not come hither, but (kî 'im) the blind and the lame shall cause you to turn aside (hesîrekā)"

The form  $\neg \neg \neg \neg$  is a Perfect<sup>2</sup> and not an Infinitive Construct ( $\neg \neg \neg \neg$ ). The LXX understood the form as a Perfect, but rendered it as a plural in past time ( $\lambda \nu \tau \acute{\epsilon} \beta \iota \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ ). The singular

<sup>1</sup>Brown-Driver-Briggs, op. cit., p. 50.

<sup>2</sup>See Koehler-Baumgartner, op. cit., p. 653.



form instead of the plural can be explained thus: "When the predicate precedes...the predicate may assume the primary form, viz., third masculine singular, whatever be the number or gender of the following subject."<sup>1</sup>

7. II Kings 4:24 "And she said to her servant:...do not restrain for me to ride, except (kî 'im) I say ('amartî) to you"
8. II Kings 5:20 " (As) the LORD lives, surely (kî 'im) I will run (rastî) after him and take (welāqabtî) from him something"

The Brown-Driver-Briggs Lexicon cites this reference and calls the simple Perfect a "pf. of certitude."<sup>2</sup> But the Perfect with waw, as well as the simple Perfect, is used in construction with the compound particle  $\text{וְ} \text{כִּי}$  : "Surely I will run...and take." Thus it too would have to be construed as a Perfect of certitude (according to the thesis of these lexicographers), if they are to be consistent in their reasoning. The presence of the Perfect with waw argues for a straight future force for both forms.

9. Ruth 3:18 "For the man will not rest, except (kî 'im) he finish (killāh) the matter to-day"

These examples show that the particle  $\text{וְ} \text{כִּי}$  and the Perfect form constitute a stereotypic construction. Such examples lend support to our thesis that elements outside the verb influence its use.

#### H. Form with $\text{וְ} \text{לֵךְ}$ :

II Kings 7:3 "And they said a man to his fellow: Why do we sit

<sup>1</sup>W. R. Harper, Elements of Hebrew Syntax (7th ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), p. 111.

<sup>2</sup>Brown-Driver-Briggs, op. cit., p. 475.



(mē'anten) to obey My commandments"  
 with Numbers 14:11 "And the LORD said to Moses: Until  
 whither (i.e. how long; 'ad 'ānāh) will this  
 people despise Me (yēna'asunî)"

These examples can be explained as those in 3 immediately  
 above.

5. Numbers 32:17 "And we ourselves will go equipped making haste  
 before the sons of Israel until that when  
 ('ad 'asēr 'im) we bring them (hābî'ōnum) to  
 their place"

6. Compare II Samuel 17:13 "And if to a city he withdraws,  
 then all Israel shall put upon that city ropes,  
 and we will drag it to the river, until that  
 ('ad 'asēr) there shall not be found (nimsā)  
 there even a pebble"

with II Samuel 17:12 "And we will come upon him in  
 one of the places where he shall be found and  
 we will settle down upon him as the dew falls  
 upon the ground, until that (wē) there shall not  
 be left (nōtar) in (=of) him and of all the men  
 who (are) with him even one"

There are parallel clauses: "until that there shall not  
 be found there even a pebble" (ver. 13) and "until that there  
 shall not be left even one" (ver. 12). Hence it is clear that  
 the waw in verse 12 is an equivalent of the compound  $\text{וְעַד} \text{וְעַד}$   
 in verse 13.

7. Ruth 2:21 "With the men who belong to me you shall remain until  
 when ('ad 'im) they finish (kallū) all the harvest"

These examples show that the particle  $\text{וְעַד}$  in compounds and the  
 Perfect form constitute a stereotypic construction. Such examples  
 Perfect form constitute a stereotypic construction. Such examples

favour our thesis that elements outside the verb influence its usage.

J. Forms with  $\text{waw}^{\text{5}}$ :

II Samuel 20:6 "You take the servants of your lord and pursue after him, lest (pen) he find (māṣā') for himself fortified cities and take away (wehissil) our eye"

If one admits that the simple Perfect is used exactly like the Perfect with waw which follows, there is no problem; but if one attempts to distinguish the use of the two forms, the problem becomes perplexing indeed. Some have evaded the difficulty confronting the aspect theory by unwarrantably altering the Perfect into an Imperfect. Others have fought the battle but apparently with little success. F. R. Blake, for example, explains it thus: "The converted perfect (an equivalent of the imperfect) is really the verb dependent on the conjunction.... The translation is 'lest having found for himself fortified cities, then he will escape our eye'.<sup>1</sup>

K. Forms with  $\text{waw}^{\text{X}}$ :

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| 1. Compare | Genesis 43:9 "I myself will become surety for him; from my hand you shall exact him. If ( <u>'im</u> ) I do not bring him ( <u>hābī'ōtīw</u> ) to you and set him ( <u>wehissagtīw</u> ) before you" |
| with       | Genesis 42:37 "And Reuben said to his father, saying: My two sons you shall put to death, if ( <u>'im</u> ) I do not bring him ( <u>'abī'ennū</u> ) to you"  |

No one would doubt that the Perfect with waw in 43:9 and the Imperfect in 42:37 are used in the same way. And further, it can hardly be doubted that the simple Perfect and the Perfect

---

<sup>1</sup>Blake, op. cit., p. 64.

with waw in 43:9 are employed in the same manner, i.e. in construction with the conditional particle  $\text{HX}$ .<sup>1</sup> It would be most arbitrary to distinguish the force of the forms, both of which are in the protasis. Now if the simple Perfect and the Perfect with waw are used identically, then it follows that the simple Perfect and the Imperfect are also to be identified in use. In fact, the constructions in which they occur are identical. We believe that examples like these clearly place an onus on the aspect theory.

2. Deuteronomy 21:14 "If ('im) you do not delight (hāpaṣtā) in her, then you shall let her go (w<sup>e</sup>šillaḥtāh)"

Note also the following verses:

- a) Judges 16:17 "If ('im) I be shaved (gullaḥtī), then my strength will depart (w<sup>e</sup>sār) from me"
- b) II Samuel 15:33 "If ('im) you go on ('ābartā) with me, then you will be (w<sup>e</sup>ḥāyitā) upon me for a burden"

In each of these examples a simple Perfect is in the protasis and a Perfect with waw in the apodosis. It seems only reasonable to assume that the Perfect with the particle  $\text{HX}$  has the same future force as the Perfect with the particle waw, i.e. if the latter is a straight (aoristic) future, so is the former.

3. II Kings 7:4 "If ('im) we say ('āmarnū)...; and if (w<sup>e</sup>'im) we sit (yāṣabnū)...; if ('im) they let us live (y<sup>e</sup>ḥayyunū)...; and if (w<sup>e</sup>'im) they put us to death (y<sup>e</sup>mīṭunū)"

The conditional clauses "if we say" and "if we sit" in

---

<sup>1</sup>In Arabic the Perfect is used in future time after the conditional particle  $\text{U}$ ; see Wright, Arabic Gram., II, p. 13.

which Perfect forms are employed are grammatically equivalent to the conditional clauses "if they let live" and "if they put to death" in which Imperfect forms are used. Hence the Perfects doubtless express the action in the same manner as the Imperfects. It is difficult to see how the concepts of completion and incompletion could enter in at all. From an objective viewpoint only an aoristic signification is applicable.

## CONCLUSION

We have attempted to give a precise evaluation of verbal usage and have therefore chosen the most significant examples for consideration.<sup>1</sup> It is readily seen that we have viewed the verb form not as an isolated factor but as a component part of an idiomatic construction (particularly a construction in which occurs a demonstrative element or at least an element of deictic origin). In our opinion, a theory based on the verb as an element by itself cannot be consonant with a proper assessment of tense usage. There appear to be numerous examples that are inexplicable if particles and/or other elements outside the verb form itself have no influence on its employment. It seems that the aspect theory has failed to give due consideration to the important factor of elemental influence and hence has been plagued with difficulties. That such is the case should be clear from a perusal of the examples in Parts III and IV.

These examples show that the aspectual theorists are confronted with a number of problematical cases. If one is rigidly to adhere to their view, one must be prepared to admit that many examples are without satisfactory explanation. Of course one could say that there are always exceptions to the rule; but when one makes such a statement one must be sure that the exceptions are relatively few in number, and, what is more important, that the rule itself is without serious defects.

It is our impression that the adherents of the aspect theory would have difficulty contending that their theory indeed meets these requirements. Many of the examples seem to point out the fallacies of the aspectual view in these vital areas; for (1) they show that there are more than just a few exceptions to the rule, and (2) they show that cases

---

<sup>1</sup>Other examples could have been given---we examined every relevant case in our research of the prose sections---which would have increased considerably the length of the dissertation, but we felt that their inclusion was unnecessary to support our thesis.

presumed to support the rule proposed by the aspectual school can in fact be construed in such a manner that they support the exceptions to the rule, and thus, when so construed, are in direct opposition to the supposed rule. Hence we contend that serious doubts are raised respecting the validity of the aspect theory, and that consequently the onus probandi lies with its exponents.

Of course this does not mean that our theory answers all the problems. Far from it! We are convinced that in our present state of knowledge there will be problems unsolved by any theory. But our theory may help to solve some of the problems, for we have approached the subject from an angle quite diverse from precedent studies.

Our hypothesis is objective in approach (as opposed to previous treatments which have been basically subjective) and thus leaves no room for the imagination; and, if it be a correct appraisal of tense use, has emancipated the forms from the aspectual concept altogether. If we have eliminated the aspectual idea, only the time concept remains. And admittedly its significance is difficult to determine. It is apparent that a survey of the forms as used in Biblical Hebrew will not reveal a temporal differentiation. Both forms are employed omnitemporally. We think, however, that such a consideration as the influence of particles and other elements on the use of the verb is pertinent.

It is our thesis that all the Imperfects in past time are vestiges of an old preterite tense of the preformative type (which was found in two forms: yagtulu and yagtul)<sup>1</sup> and are consequently found in stereotyped constructions. They have been preserved simply because they are in construction with certain particles and other elements. The preteritive use of the Imperfect is not restricted to instances with waw consecutive and other particles such as 'az and terem; additional particles are also

---

<sup>1</sup>See Z. Harris, Development of the Canaanite Dialects, pp. 46-47.



used with the Imperfect in a preterite sense. Also, we postulate that all the Perfects in future time are straight (aoristic) future tenses and, like the Imperfects in past time, are to be regarded as archaisms. This futuristic use harks back to the time when the old affirmative verb gatil (gatal) was employed in future situations. Hence the Perfect is found in future time in stereotypic construction with other elements--not simply with waw consecutive but with other particles as well. It would seem then that the Zeitpunkt does come under consideration in an evaluation of the usage of the forms and is indicated by factors external to the verb.

In fine, a word should be said about the Perfect with waw in past time. The Perfect with waw consecutive is used like the Imperfect, and hence is a preterite tense. It may be an archaism, as G. R. Driver contends,<sup>1</sup> or it may be a later development incorporated into idioms containing the Imperfect. The Perfect with waw copulative is of course also a preterite, but its force is not a matter of dispute. It may have developed at the same time as the simple Perfect in past time, with which it often appears.

Actually what we have propounded in our study is far from a full-orbed theory; there are too many factors which elude our comprehension. But inter alia it has been our desire to provoke thought in areas whose depths have hardly begun to be plumbed. Whether or not we have been successful in our task, it is left for others to decide.

---

1G. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 113.

Chapter II  
The Infinitive Absolute

Although some of the uses of the Infinitive Absolute have been classified with some degree of certainty, it seems that there should be a general re-examination of its functions. All too often in grammars this verbal noun is considered quite superficially. Certain usages are listed without thought of variation. We question some of the "standard" uses, especially in cases where the Infinitive is employed adverbially; and hence we devoted a portion of our research period to a survey of this verb form. According to our survey, here are the principal usages:

1. As subject:

Proverbs 25:27 "Eating (i.e. to eat; \*ākōl) honey to multiply (is) not good"

We may phrase it thus: "To eat honey to excess is not good."

2. As predicate nominative:

Isaiah 32:17 "And the work (i.e. effect) of righteousness (is) exhibiting quietness (i.e. to exhibit quietness; hašqēṭ) and (=with) trust"

We may phrase it thus: "The effect of righteousness is to exhibit quietness with trust."

3. As direct object:

Isaiah 1:16,17 "Cease doing evil (i.e. to do evil; hārē'a); learn doing good (i.e. to do good; hêtēb)"

4. As genitive:

Proverbs 21:16 "A man who errs from a way of acting prudently (haškēl), in the congregation of the sunken ones

(i.e. the dead) he shall rest"

We may phrase it thus: "If a man errs from a way of acting prudently, he shall rest in the company of the dead."

5. After a preposition:

- a) Joshua 2:16 "Until (ad) the pursuers' returning (ḥôb)"<sup>1</sup>

In verse 22 the finite verb appears after  $\tau\chi$ :  
 "until (ad) the pursuers had returned (šābû)."

- b) I Samuel 1:9 "And Hannah arose after ('aharê) eating ('oldāh) in Shiloh and after (we'aharê) drinking (šātōh)"

The Infinitive Absolute is used like the Infinitive Construct which precedes it. It is arbitrary to delete the expression "and after eating" (as Rudolph Kittel has done in the Biblia Hebraica critical apparatus) and to insert, following the LXX,  $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta} \quad \bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta} \quad \bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$ .

- c) Judges 13:21 "And the Angel of the LORD did not add again to appear (1ehērā'ōh) to Manoah"  
Cf. I Samuel 3:21 "And the LORD added to appear (1ehērā'ōh) in Shiloh"<sup>2</sup>

6. As a complement of the verb:

- a) Isaiah 42:24 "And they were not willing in His ways walking (i.e. to walk; hālôk)"

<sup>1</sup>There is no warrant for assuming with Brockelmann (Hebräische Syntax, p. 48) that the Infinitive "für 110 falsch punktiert ist."

2Brockelmann (ibid.) gratuitously thinks it probable that the text in both places is corrupt. This indicates an evasion rather than a solution of the problem. Who are we to say that the Infinitive absolute could not be used with prepositions?

We may phrase it thus: "And they refused to walk in His ways."

- b) Isaiah 57:20 "For exhibiting quietness (hašqēt) it is not able"

We may phrase it thus: "For it is not able to exhibit quietness."

7. As an appositive (after a demonstrative pronoun):

Zechariah 14:12 "And this (wezō't) shall be the plague with which the LORD shall smite all the people who have waged war against Jerusalem: causing his flesh to waste away (hāmēq)"

8. As an explication:

Jeremiah 22:19 "With the burial of an ass he shall be buried: dragging (sāhōb) and casting away (wehašlēk)"

9. Some Infinitives of the Hiphil stem (theme) are practically pure adverbs in usage:

- a) I Samuel 17:16 "And the Philistine drew near, doing (the drawing near) at morning (haškēm) and doing (the drawing near) at evening (weha'arēb)"

We may say: "And the Philistine drew near morning and evening." But it must be remembered that the force of the Hiphil underlies the usage.

- b) II Kings 10:18 "Jehu shall serve him doing much (harbēh) (the serving)"

We may say: "Jehu shall serve him doing it much." This amounts to saying: "Jehu shall serve him much."

10. A common construction is that of the Infinitive Absolute immediately preceding a finite verb of the same root; evidently the Infinitive emphasized the verbal idea in some way:<sup>1</sup>

Genesis 2:17 "Dying (môt) you shall die (tāmût)"

This is a difficult usage to render into English. The Infinitive often seems to be employed otiosely, but doubtless it was full of import in the living language. Perhaps by underlining the finite verb the stress (if indeed the Infinitive indicates stress) can best be conveyed in English: "You shall die." Or the Infinitive may have had some euphonic value.<sup>2</sup>

11. A similar construction is that of a single Infinitive Absolute immediately following a finite verb of the same root:

Isaiah 6:9 "Go and say to this people: Hear (šimē'û) hearing (šāmō'a)"

This is difficult to analyze. Our remarks in 10 above can probably apply to this usage also.

12. It should be noted that some connection must exist between certain uses of the Infinitive Absolute and the separate personal pronoun.<sup>3</sup> The following examples may be cited:

a) Compare I Kings 8:13 "Building (bānōh) I have built (bānîti) a house of elevation for Thee"

---

<sup>1</sup>S. R. Driver (op. cit., pp. 241-242) compares uses of the Infinitive Absolute with those of the Arabic energetic.

<sup>2</sup>See Gesenius-Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 345.

<sup>3</sup>See Gesenius-Kautzsch, ibid., pp. 345, 444.

- with // II Chronicles 6:2 "And I (wa'anî), I have built (bānîti) a house of elevation for Thee"
- b) Compare Judges 11:25 "Did striving (harôb) he strive with Israel or ('im) fighting (nilhôm) did he fight against them"
- with Judges 6:31 "Will you (ha'atten), you strive for Baal or ('im) you ('atten), you deliver him"
- c) Compare Exodus 2:19 "And also (wegam) drawing (dālôh) he drew for us"
- with I Samuel 1:28 "And also (wegam) I ('ānōkî), I have given him on request to the LORD"
- d) Compare Judges 15:13 "And killing (w'hāmēt) we will not (lō') kill you"
- with Judges 20:34 "And they (w'hēm), they did not (lō') know"

13. Successive Infinitive Absolutes after the finite verb (at least one of which is a verb of movement):

a) the Infinitives express unrelated ideas:

1. Judges 14:9 "And he went, going (hālôk) and eating (w'e'ākôl)"

The first Infinitive, being of the same root as the main verb and also a verb of movement, modifies the main verb by extending in space the verbal action: "he went on." In this connection it is very important to distinguish the meanings of the synonyms "continuation," "continuance" and "continuity." The first (continuation) suggests the carrying onwards or extension of an action. The second (continuance) suggests the carrying onwards or extension of an action but with the added idea of

duration. The third (continuity) suggests the carrying onwards or extension of an action but in addition implies the uninterrupted or unbroken extension of the action. The failure to distinguish these usages results in much confusion. In our opinion it is the idea of "continuation" that is expressed by the Infinitive Absolute. In other words, the Infinitive carries onwards or extends in space the action of the verb and nothing more. The additional ideas of duration and uninterrupted or unbroken extension do not enter in.

The second Infinitive denotes the attendant circumstance: "And he went on, eating." The first Infinitive is a verb of movement, but the second is not; so they express unrelated ideas.

- ii. I Samuel 6:12 "And they went, going (hālōk) and lowing (wegā'ō)"

The first Infinitive does not modify the second. Rather it modifies the principal verb which is from the same verbal root and also a verb of motion: "And they went on." The second Infinitive, a verb of non-motion, simply denotes the attendant circumstance: "And they went on, lowing."

It would be well to consider further the connection (or rather non-connection) between "going" and "lowing." The Infinitive  $\overline{\text{h}}\overline{\text{a}}\overline{\text{l}}\overline{\text{o}}\overline{\text{k}}$ , as a verb of movement, has a spatial connotation, but not so  $\overline{\text{w}}\overline{\text{e}}\overline{\text{g}}\overline{\text{a}}\overline{\text{'o}}$ . Therefore it is impossible to translate thus: "lowing on," for that would mean an extension in space of an action which is non-spatial.

- iii. II Samuel 16:5 "And behold thence a man came out (yōsē')...he came out (yōsē'), coming out



(yāsô') and cursing (ûm<sup>e</sup>qallēl)"1

In this example the participle  $\chi\zeta(\Pi)'$  is used twice; but in the first clause the man is already mentioned as coming out, so probably the expressions are to be rendered as follows: "And a man came out...he came on out," the Infinitive of the same root as the main verb extending in space the verbal action. The participle  $\zeta\zeta\rho\eta$  "cursing" merely denotes the attendant circumstance: "he came on out, cursing."

b) the Infinitives express related ideas:

- i. Genesis 8:3 "And the waters returned from upon the earth, going (hālôk) and returning (wāsôb)"

The first Infinitive  $\gamma i \zeta \eta$  modifies the second Infinitive  $\gamma i \psi$  and denotes an extension in space of the one action in progress: "And the waters returned, going on back." The Infinitive  $\gamma i \psi$  is translated "going back" and the Infinitive  $\gamma i \zeta \eta$  is rendered "on," so  $\gamma i \zeta \eta$  extends in space  $\gamma i \psi$ . Both Infinitives are verbs of movement and hence express related ideas.

- ii. Genesis 8:5 "And the waters were going (hālôk) and diminishing (wehāsôr)"

We may phrase it thus: "And the waters were going on down." The Infinitive  $\gamma i \zeta \eta$  translated "on" modifies the other Infinitive  $\gamma i \psi \eta$  rendered "going down."

- iii. Genesis 12:9 "And Abram pulled up, going (hālôk) and journeying (wenāsô'a) towards the Negeb"

Here the main verb is a participle and not a finite verb; and there are not successive Infinitives, but the participle  $\zeta\zeta\rho\eta$  is employed like an Infinitive.

We may phrase it thus: "And Abram pulled up journeying on towards the Negeb."

- iv. Genesis 8:7 "And it went out, going out (yāsô) and returning (wāšôb)"

The Infinitives express related but alternating ideas. The "going out" and "returning" are not synchronous actions but alternating actions within the cycle of flight. These Infinitives may be viewed thus: "And it went out forth and back," or they may extend in space the verbal action: "And it went on out and came on back." There may be an ellipsis of the main verb  $\begin{smallmatrix} \text{ל} & \text{ו} & \text{ש} & \text{ב} \\ \text{ו} & \text{ו} & \text{ו} & \text{ו} \end{smallmatrix}$  before  $\begin{smallmatrix} \text{ל} & \text{ו} & \text{ש} & \text{ב} \\ \text{ו} & \text{ו} & \text{ו} & \text{ו} \end{smallmatrix}$ .

14. An extension of the verbal idea (verbs of non-motion):

- a) Jeremiah 6:29 "In vain they refine refining (sārôp)"

The Infinitive extends the verbal idea, but it is a verb of non-movement. We may render the expression thus: "they refine on," i.e. "they go on refining" or "they continue to refine." It is not that they refine continually, but that the process of refining is extended. The extension, however, is not a spatial extension; for the verb "refine" is a verb of non-movement.

- b) Jeremiah 23:17 "The ones who say saying (ʾāmôr)"

We may render the expression thus: "The ones who say on," i.e. "The ones who go on saying" or "The ones who continue to say."

15. An Infinitive with prefixed waw parallel to a noun with prefixed preposition (used as an adverbial accusative):

Psalms 126:6 "Going one shall go and weeping (ûbākôh)...  
coming one shall come with a joyful ringing

cry (b'errinnāh)"

The expressions are parallel; hence we may render them thus: "Going one shall go with weeping...coming one shall come with a joyful ringing cry."

16. Nearer definition:

Jeremiah 25:3 "And I spoke to you, rising early (\*aškēm) and speaking (wedabbēr)"

The first Infinitive is adverbial to the second, which is from the same root as the finite verb. The action of speaking is defined either as to manner "speaking assiduously" or as to time "speaking in season and out of season."

17. Intensification:

a) Deuteronomy 9:21 "And I beat it fine, grinding (tāhōn) (it) doing (it) well (hētēb)"

There is a double intensification; the first Infinitive intensifies the action of the main verb, and the second Infinitive intensifies the action of the first Infinitive. This emphasizes the complete destruction of the idol.

b) Isaiah 14:23 "And I will sweep it with a broom, exterminating (hašmēd) (it)"

The Infinitive is usually taken as a substantive in the genitive case: "with the broom of extermination." But we believe that our rendering is more in line with the usual force of the Infinitive Absolute.

18. Successive Infinitives, the first is from the same root as the main verb and the second denotes purpose or result:

a) I Kings 20:37 "And the man smote him, smiting (hakkēh) and wounding (ūpāsō'a)"

The Infinitive y'xw denotes the result: "smiting so that he wounded."

- b) Isaiah 19:22 "And the LORD will smite Egypt, smiting (nāgōp)  
and healing (werāpō')"

The Infinitive  $\times \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} \text{5} \\ \text{7} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  denotes the design: "smiting in order to heal." It is remedial smiting.

- c) Jeremiah 12:17 "And I will pluck up that nation, plucking up  
(nātôš) and destroying (wə'abbēd)"

The Infinitive  $\tau \text{ } \underline{\text{d}} \text{ } \times$  denotes the design: "plucking up in order to destroy."

19. The simple Perfect, the Perfect with waw and the Imperfect with waw consecutive used like an Infinitive Absolute;<sup>1</sup>

- a) Joshua 6:13a "And the seven priests bearing the seven trumpets of rams' horns before the ark of the LORD went going (hālôk) and blowing (wetāqecû) with the trumpets"

In verse 13b an Infinitive Absolute, from the same root as the Perfect in 13a, follows a participle ( קֹתִיב; *Qethîbh*), which is used like an Infinitive Absolute. Note also verse 9 where an Infinitive Absolute from the same root as the Perfect in 13a follows another Infinitive Absolute.

- b) I Samuel 19:23 "And he went going (hālôk) and prophesying (wayyitnabbē') until his coming to Naioth in Ramah"
- c) II Samuel 13:19 "And she went going (hālôk) and crying out

Because they are used like the Infinitive Absolute, it seems better to enter these examples here than in Chapter I.

(wəzā'āqāh)"<sup>1</sup>

d) II Samuel 16:13 "And Shimei went on the side of the hill parallel with him, going (hālôk) and cursing (wayeqallêl) and stoning (wayesacqêl) with stones at him and dusting (wə'ippar) with dust"<sup>2</sup>

e) Compare Joshua 11:12 "And they smote them with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying (heh<sup>er</sup>rîm) them"

and I Kings 20:21 "And the king of Israel went out and smote the horses and the chariots (i.e. riders), and smiting (wəhikkāh) Aram with a great smiting"

with Joshua 11:11 "And they smote all the persons who (were) in it with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying (hah<sup>er</sup>rēm) (them)"

and I Kings 20:37 "And the man smote him, smiting (hakkēh) and wounding (him)"

The direct object is expressed after the Perfect in Joshua 11:12 and the Perfect with waw in I Kings 20:21. In Joshua 11:11 and I Kings 20:37, however, the object is unexpressed after the Infinitive Absolute. Howbeit the verb forms seem to have the same force.

## 20. As a finite verb:

a) As an Imperative:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The LXX κρᾶζουε = ἡδύτ used like an Infinitive Absolute.

<sup>2</sup>The LXX καταρώμενος... λιβάζων... πλέγων = ἡδύτ... ἡδύτ... ἡδύτ? used like an Infinitive Absolute. Note verse 5 where the participle ἡδύτ follows an Infinitive Absolute in a manner corresponding to ἡδύτ? with the precedent Infinitive Absolute.

<sup>3</sup>Brockelmann (Hebräische Syntax, p. 1) asserts that the Infinitive Absolute is the oldest form in commands.

Compare Deuteronomy 5:12 "Keep (šāmôr) the Sabbath day to sanctify it"  
 with Deuteronomy 6:17 "Keeping (šāmôr) you shall keep (tišmêrûn) the commandments of the LORD"

A comparison of these examples may lend support to W. R. Harper's statement that the Imperative usage of the Infinitive "is probably due to the ellipsis of the finite verb."<sup>1</sup>

b) As an equivalent of other finite verbs;

Compare Isaiah 37:18,19 "Truly, O LORD, the kings of Assyria have destroyed (heherîbû) all the countries and their land and have given (wênātôn) their gods into the fire"  
 with // II Kings 19:17,18 "Truly, O LORD, the kings of Assyria have destroyed (heherîbû) the nations and their land and have given (wênātônû) their gods into the fire"

The parallel indicates that there is no difference in force between the Infinitive Absolute in Isaiah and the Perfect with waw in II Kings.

---

<sup>1</sup>Harper, op. cit., p. 88.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Barth, J. Die Pronominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1913.
- Bauer, H. and Leander, P. Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments. Vol. I. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1922.
- Bergsträsser, G. Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen. München: Max Hueber, 1928.
- Blake, F. R. A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1951.
- Böttcher, F. Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache. Vol. II. Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1868.
- Brockelmann, C. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen. Vol. II. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Hebräische Syntax. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1956.
- Burton, E. D. Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898.
- Davidson, A. B. Hebrew Syntax. 3rd. ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.
- Dillmann, A. Ethiopic Grammar. 2nd ed. Translated by J. A. Crichton. London: Williams and Norgate, 1907.
- Driver, G. R. Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.
- Driver, S. R. A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew. 3rd. ed. revised. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.
- Ewald, H. Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes. 8th ed. Göttingen: Dieterichsche Buchhandlung, 1870.

- Gesenius, W. Hebräische Grammatik. 27th ed. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1902.
- Hammershainb, E. Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Schamra. Kopenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1941.
- Harper, W. R. Elements of Hebrew Syntax. 7th ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- Keil, C. F. Biblischer Commentar über die Bücher Mose's. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1862.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Biblischer Commentar über die Prophetischen Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1864, 1865.
- König, E. Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache. 2nd half, Part I. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1895.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache. 2nd half, Part II. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897.
- Nakaraï, T. W. Biblical Hebrew. Philadelphia: Maurice Jacobs, 1951.
- Nöldeke, T. Compendious Syriac Grammar. Translated by J. A. Crichton. London: Williams and Norgate, 1904.
- Nordheimer, I. A Critical Grammar of the Hebrew Language. Vol. II. New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1841.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. 4th ed. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Thacker, T. W. The Relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian Verbal Systems. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.
- Ungnad, A. Babylonisch-assyrische Grammatik. 2nd ed. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926.
- Weingreen, J. A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.



Wright, W. A Grammar of the Arabic Language. Vols. I and II.  
2nd ed. revised. London: Frederic Norgate, 1874, 1875.

\_\_\_\_\_. Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. Cambridge: University Press, 1890.

Wuest, K. S. Hebrews in the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids:  
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

N.B. Engnell's recent Hebrew Grammar (in Swedish) is on order, but we have been unable to evaluate it.

#### Volumes in a series

Gordon, C. H. "Ugaritic Handbook," Analecta Orientalia, No. 25  
(1947).

Harris, Z. S. "Development of the Canaanite Dialects," American Oriental Series, Vol. 16 (1939).

Von Soden, W. "Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik," Analecta Orientalia, No. 33 (1952).

#### Papers and Articles

Bauer, H. "Die Tempora im Semitischen," Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, Vol. 8, Part I  
(1910).

Cazelles, H. "Note sur l'origine des temps convertis hébreux (d'après quelques textes ugaritiques)," Revue Biblique, LIV (1947), pp. 388-393.

Ginsberg, H. L. "The Rebellion and Death of Ba'lu," Orientalia, Vol. 5 (1936), pp. 161-198.

Goetze, A. "The Tenses of Ugaritic," American Oriental Society Offprint Series, No. 8 (1938), pp. 266-309.

Greenberg, J. H. "The Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Present," Journal

of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 72 (1952), pp. 1-9.

- Harris, R. L. "Tenses of the Hebrew Verb," The Journal (Faith Theological Seminary Alumni Association), V. No. 1 (Fall, 1952), pp. 8-13.
- Harris, Z. S. "A Conditioned Sound Change in Ras Shamra," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 57 (1937), pp. 151-157.
- Kienast, B. "Das Punktualthema \*yaprus und seine Modi," Orientalia, Vol. 29 (1960), pp. 151-167.
- Maag, V. "Morphologie des hebräischen Narrative," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Vol. 65 (1953), pp. 86-88.
- Meyer, R. "Das Hebräische Verbalsystem im Lichte der gegenwärtigen Forschung," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. VII (1960), pp. 309-317.
- Thierry, G. J. "Notes on Hebrew Grammar and Etymology," Oudtestamentische Studien, Vol. IX (1951), pp. 1-17.

#### Dictionaries

- Brown, F. (Driver, S. R. and Briggs, C. A.) A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.
- Delitzsch, F. Assyrisches Handwörterbuch. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896.
- Gesenius, W. (Duhl, F.) Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament. 12th ed. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1895.
- Gesenius, W. Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Lipsiae: Fr. Chr. Guil. Vogelii, 1833.
- Koehler, L. and Baumgartner, W. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

## Abstract

### SOME PROBLEMS OF THE HEBREW VERBAL SYSTEM WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE USE OF THE TENSES

by James Aiken Hughes

This dissertation is divided into two chapters: the first chapter deals with some problems of the Hebrew tenses; the second chapter is a study on the principal uses of the Infinitive Absolute.

#### Chapter I The Tenses

After an exhaustive survey primarily devoted to the uses of the simple Imperfect and the Perfect with waw in past time and the simple Perfect in future time in the prose sections of the Old Testament, we have reached the following conclusions:

1. Both tense forms express the action indefinitely (i.e. without regard to progress or completion), in a way comparable to the Greek aorist tense. Hence we oppose the time-honoured theory which asserts that the Perfect denotes completed action and the Imperfect incomplete action. The distinction in form can be explained not by verbal use in Hebrew (apart from the Perfect of stative verbs) but by positing an original distinction (probably a stative force for the qatil form and an active force for the yagtul form) which became obliterated when the qatil (qatal) form gathered active meaning.

2. All the Imperfects in past time are vestiges of an old preterite tense of the preformative type (which was found in two forms: yagtulu and yagtul).

3. All the Perfects in future time are survivals from the period when the old affirmative verb qatil (qatal) was employed in future situations.

4. Particles and other elements (particularly a demonstrative element, or at least an element of deictic origin) are influential in verbal usage. In other words, an Imperfect occurs in past time not to denote the incompleteness or continuance of an action but because it is in construction with a particle and/or other elements. The particle and the verb constitute a stereotyped syntactical arrangement. The preteritive use of the Imperfect is not restricted to instances with *waw* consecutive and other particles such as 'āz and terem: additional particles are also used with the Imperfect in a preterite sense. Similarly, a Perfect occurs in future time not to denote the certainty of the occurrence of an action but because it is in stereotypic construction with other elements. The futuristic use is not limited to cases with *waw* consecutive: other particles are also used with the Perfect in a straight (aoristic) future sense. In the light of these statements, the time of the action (in the case of both tenses) is indicated by factors outside the verb form itself.

5. The Perfect with *waw* consecutive in past time is used like the Imperfect, so it likewise is a preterite tense. The Perfect with *waw* copulative is of course also a preterite, but its force is not a matter of dispute.

## Chapter II

### The Infinitive Absolute

Our research was concerned principally with the adverbial uses of this verbal noun. It is our impression that some of these usages have been misunderstood. For example, when an Infinitive expressing movement (such as hālôk "going") follows a verb of the same root, this Infinitive extends in space the verbal action, i.e. it denotes a continuation of the verbal idea: "he went on." The term "continuation" signifies a mere

extension of the action: it suggests neither duration (implied in the term "continuance") nor uninterrupted (implied in the term "continuity").

Also, when there are successive Infinitives, one a verb of movement and the other a verb of non-movement (as in I Samuel 6:12, "And they went, going (hālōk) and lowing (wēgā'ô)"), the former is not to be viewed as modifying the latter ("lowing on"). Rather it modifies the main verb ("they went on") which is from the same root and is also a verb of movement. The Infinitive "lowing," a verb of non-motion, simply denotes the attendant circumstance: "they went on, lowing." If on the other hand both Infinitives are verbs of movement (as in Genesis 8:3, "And the waters returned from upon the earth, going (hālōk) and returning (wāšôb)"), the first modifies the second and denotes an extension in space of the one action in progress: "And the waters returned, going on back."

In fine, it should be mentioned that the idea of "extension" can relate to verbs of non-motion (as in Jeremiah 23:17, "The ones who say saying ('āmôr)," i.e. who say on), but in such cases it is a non-spatial extension.